R E P O R T   R E S U M E S

ED 003 424   24

AN INDEPENDENT EVALUATION OF THE 1962 SUMMER INSTITUTE
PROGRAM OF THE COMMISSION ON ENGLISH OF THE COLLEGE ENTRANCE
EXAMINATION BOARD, WITH RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE
INSTITUTES.
BY- GERBER, JOHN C.
IOWA UNIV., IOWA CITY
REPORT NUMBER CRP-G-004   PUB DATE   63
EDRS PRICE MF-$0.27 HC-$5.32   133P.

DESCRIPTORS- *ENGLISH, *TEACHER EDUCATION, *UNIVERSITIES,
*HIGH SCHOOLS, *EVALUATION, SUMMER PROGRAMS, INSTITUTE TYPE
COURSES, COLLEGE ENTRANCE EXAMINATION BOARD (CEEB), IOWA
CITY, IOWA

THE OBJECTIVES WERE TO EVALUATE THE 1962 SUMMER INSTITUTE PROGRAM OF THE COMMISSION ON ENGLISH OF THE COLLEGE ENTRANCE EXAMINATION BOARD (CEEB). EACH OF THE 20 INSTITUTES WAS EVALUATED SEPARATELY SINCE EACH WAS RELATIVELY INDEPENDENT. AS PART OF THE EFFORT, AN ATTEMPT WAS MADE TO EVALUATE THE EFFECT OF THE INSTITUTE TRAINING UPON THE PARTICIPANTS AFTER THEY HAD RETURNED TO THEIR CLASSROOMS. THE PROCEDURAL TASKS WERE (1) TO ESTABLISH CRITERIA FOR THE EVALUATION, (2) TO COLLECT DATA ON THE INSTITUTES THEMSELVES, AND (3) TO EVALUATE THE DATA IN TERMS OF THE CRITERIA. THE CONCLUSIONS REPORTED WERE (1) INSTITUTES SHOULD AIM TO IMPROVE THE ACADEMIC PREPARATION AND TEACHING SKILLS OF THE PARTICIPANTS, (2) STAFF SHOULD INCLUDE A DIRECTOR, INDIVIDUAL COURSE INSTRUCTORS, A WORKSHOP SUPERVISOR, AND A PART-TIME SECRETARY, (3) PARTICIPANTS SHOULD BE SCREENED FOR HOMOGENEITY, (4) CURRICULUM SHOULD BE THE STANDARD ONE DEVISED BY CEEB, (5) DIAGNOSTIC TESTS SHOULD NOT BE NECESSARY, (6) PHYSICAL CHARACTERISTICS OF AN INSTITUTE SHOULD ACCOMMODATE THE LOCAL SITUATION, AND (7) FOLLOWUP VISITS SHOULD BE MADE BY THE WORKSHOP SUPERVISOR TO THE HIGH SCHOOLS DURING THE SECOND SEMESTER FOLLOWING THE INSTITUTE. TC)

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION AND WELFARE
Office of Education
This document has been reproduced exactly as received from the person or organization originating it. Points of view or opinions stated do not necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

AN INDEPENDENT EVALUATION OF THE 1962 SUMMER INSTITUTE PROGRAM OF THE COMMISSION ON ENGLISH OF THE COLLEGE ENTRANCE EXAMINATION BOARD, WITH RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE INSTITUTES

Cooperative Research Project No. G-004

John C. Gerber

University of Iowa
Iowa City, Iowa

1963

The research reported herein was supported by the Cooperative Research Program of the Office of Education, U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

ED 003424

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Problem. 1

Objectives 4

Related Research 5

Procedure. 6

Analysis of the Data and Findings. 10

  Aims of the Institutes. 10

  Staff 16

  Participants. 24

  Curriculum. 28

  Diagnostic Tests. 53

  Physical Characteristics and Arrangements 55

  Immediate Results 62

Conclusions and Recommendations. 68

  Aims. 68

  Staff 69

  Participants. 71

  Curriculum. 74

  Diagnostic Tests. 80

  Physical Characteristics and Arrangements 80

  Follow-up Activities. 82

Appendices 83

  Appendix A, Checklist for Visitors to Institutes. 84

  Appendix B, Participants' Questionnaire on Institutes . . 93

  Appendix C, Directors' Questionnaire on Institutes. . . . 97

Appendix D, Schedule of Visits to Institutes. 105

Appendix E, Checklist for Follow-up Discussions with Participants. 107

Appendix F, Checklist for Follow-up Discussions with Principals. 111

Appendix G, Participants' Follow-up Questionnaire . . .113

Appendix H, Schedule of Follow-up Visits. 116

Appendix I, Literature Course Ratings 119

Appendix J, Language Course Ratings 121

Appendix K, Composition Course Ratings. 123

Appendix L, Length of Institutes and Credit Granted . .125

TABLES

Contribution of Institutes to participants' intellectual growth and teaching skill 12
Effectiveness of Institutes in achieving aims. 16
Ratings of Institute instructors 22
Participant preferences for curricula. 53
Participant ratings of work load in Institutes 59
Participant ratings of length of term. 59

FOREWORD

A report like this is never the work of a single person. For the material here and for most of the evaluations I am indebted, literally, to hundreds of persons. The staffs of the 20 Institutes sponsored by the Commission on English were most cooperative and helpful. Over 800 of the participants took the time to make out long questionnaires during the crowded hours of the Institute sessions. Later, 64 of these received our Evaluators in their high schools, and took a good part of a school day talking and completing another questionnaire about the Institutes. The principals of these 64 participants also were most helpful in giving their impressions of the effects of the Institutes upon the teachers who attended them. Continually anticipating our needs, Mr. Floyd Rinker and his associates on the Commission on English supplied us with all of the material in their office that could conceivably aid in the development of this evaluation. My chief indebtedness is due to the 12 Evaluators who late in May reorganized their entire summers in order to be a part of this project. It is hard to see how they could have been more dedicated to the project. To all of these and, of course, to the secretaries--Mrs. Don Sehr and Mrs. Brenda Bormann--go my grateful thanks.

Iowa City, Iowa
September, 1963

John C. Gerber

PROBLEM

From almost the beginning of tax-supported education in the United States, Americans have generously supported the teaching of English in the nation's schools. Through their school boards they have continued over the years to make it a required subject. Despite such endorsement, however, there has been growing dissatisfaction with the results. Both the goals and the methods of English teachers have been criticized, sometimes unfairly, sometimes with good reason.

English teachers themselves have not been totally satisfied with their work. Through its Curriculum Commission and other agencies, for example, the National Council of Teachers of English has for years been issuing books and monographs designed to aid administrators and teachers in improving English courses. In 1958, to cite another example, the Conference on Basic Issues, sponsored jointly by the Modern Language Association, the National Council of Teachers of English, the College English Association, and the American Studies Association, agreed on a list of fundamental issues facing the profession and proposed a plan to improve the teaching of English from kindergarten through graduate college in four pilot states. Without adequate financial support, however, this promising program never became a reality. It remained for the Commission on English of the College Entrance Examination Board not only to devise a concrete program for the upgrading of the teaching of English but also, with the help of five foundations,[1] to provide the financial backing to put the program into effect on a broad geographical basis. Although the Commission's program of 20 Summer Institutes was intended to improve instruction in English only at the secondary level and only for students intending to go to college, its effects, it was hoped, would be felt at all levels and by all types of students.

---

[1] The Bing Fund, the Danforth Foundation, the Hobby Foundation, the Old Dominion Foundation, and the Victoria Foundation, Inc.

Since the Commission hoped to invigorate the teaching of English on a national scale, it invited Departments of English in 20 universities from coast to coast to act as hosts for the Institutes. The first 20 to be invited accepted: Cornell, Duke, Harvard, Indiana, New York University, Ohio State, Penn State, Rutgers, St. Louis, Southern Illinois, Stanford, State University of New York-State College at Albany, Tulane, University of California at Los Angeles, University of Michigan, University of Nevada, University of Pittsburgh, University of Texas, University of Washington, and University of Wisconsin. With the exception of the plains states and the Rocky Mountain states, nearly every section of the country was represented. A full year before the Institutes were to open, each of the 20 universities sent its prospective Institute directors and instructors to a Planning Institute held at the University of Michigan in the summer of 1961. This planning conference was directed by Floyd Rinker and his associates on the Commission; those in charge of the major sections were Helen C. White (literature), W. Nelson Francis (language), and Albert R. Kitzhaber (composition). From this conference came the general format and the syllabi that were followed at all Institutes, even though the Institutes were administered independently.

Each Institute invited a maximum of 45 participants selected for their training, experience, and interest in college preparatory students. Because of the support received from the Commission on English, each

Institute was able to grant every participant tuition and a stipend of $350. It was the hope of the Commission that such grants would attract 900 master teachers whose revitalization because of the Institute program would, in the following school year alone, affect for the better the training of over 100,000 high-school students. Indirectly, moreover, the Commission hoped that the training of hundreds of thousands of other students would be improved by the spreading influence of these 900 teachers, by the development of other institutes based on the CEEB model, by articles about the Institutes in professional journals, and by speeches about them at professional meetings.

As influential as they were expected to be, however, it was clear that if these 1962 Summer Institutes were to be of maximum value to the profession, they needed to be evaluated by an independent agency. With the endorsement of the Commission on English of the CEEB, the University of Iowa applied to the Office of Education for a grant for the purpose of undertaking such an evaluation, and this application was subsequently approved. Briefly, then, the project described in this report was an independent evaluation of the 1962 Summer Institute Program of the CEEB Commission on English: its ends, means, and immediate effects.

OBJECTIVES

Those directing and participating in this independent evaluation had four major objectives:

1. To evaluate the 1962 Summer Institute Program of the Commission on English, its ends and its means.
2. To evaluate the work of each Institute, since each was a relatively autonomous enterprise, against the work of the group as a whole.
3. To evaluate the effect of the Institute training upon the participants after they returned to their classrooms.
4. To report these findings and to make recommendations for those planning similar institutes.

RELATED RESEARCH

Since this project involved an evaluation of a specific and unique program, there was no previous research which bore directly upon the substantive aspects of the problem.

For methodology the most valuable aid was the report of the group that evaluated the NDEA Language Institute Program for the summer of 1960. This group was headed by Professor Stephen A. Freeman, Vice-president and Director of the Middlebury Summer Language Schools, Middlebury College.

PROCEDURE

Step 1. Selection of a Staff

The staff members were selected by the Chief Investigator, Dr. John C. Gerber, Chairman of the Department of English, University of Iowa. The staff included the following, who in this report will be called Evaluators:

Dr. William P. Albrecht, Chairman of the Department of English, University of Kansas

Dr. Dwight L. Burton, Professor of English Education, Florida State University

Dr. Leon T. Dickinson, Chairman of the Department of English, University of Missouri

Dr. Frederick L. Gwynn, Chairman of the Department of English, Trinity College

Dr. Sumner Ives, Professor of English, Syracuse University

Dr. John E. Jordan, Professor of English, University of California, Berkeley

Dr. John C. McGalliard, Professor of English, University of Iowa

Miss Lorietta Scheerer, teacher of English, Redondo Union High School, Redondo Beach, California

Dr. Eugene E. Slaughter, Chairman of the Department of English, Southeastern State College, Durant, Oklahoma

Dr. Donald R. Tuttle, Specialist for College English, Office of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare

Mrs. Rosemary G. Wilson, Assistant Director, Curriculum Office, Board of Public Education, School District of Philadelphia, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

Dr. John McLaughlin, Associate Professor of English, University of Iowa, who helped only with the follow-up visits.

Step 2. First Staff Conference

The first conference of the Chief Investigator, Evaluators, and the conference secretary was held at the Palmer House, Chicago, June 1-3, 1962. Consultants attending the meetings were Mr. Floyd Rinker, Director of the Commission on English, and Mr. James Spillane of the Office of Education. Mr. Rinker attended the meetings during the first day, Mr. Spillane during all three days. The conference included the following activities:

a. Explanation of the background of the project and of the CEEB Summer Institutes.

b. Agreement upon the aspects to be especially noted in the process of evaluation: aims, staff (administrative and instructional), participants, curriculum (courses, workshop, tests, integration of work), physical characteristics (size, schedule, classrooms, housing, dining).

c. Preparation of a checklist to be used in evaluating the Institutes. (See Appendix A.)

d. Preparation of a questionnaire to be submitted to the participants and one to be submitted to Institute directors. (See Appendices B and C.)

e. Scheduling of the visits to the Institutes. (See Appendix D.)

After this conference the Chief Investigator refined the checklists and questionnaires and, together with report forms, had them mimeographed and distributed to the Evaluators.

Step 3. Visits to the Institutes

With one exception each Institute was visited at least twice; the exception was visited only once because the scheduled Evaluator became ill at the last moment. A regular visit consisted of one Evaluator staying at an Institute for the 5 days of a school week, attending classes, interviewing the staff and participants, and talking with the department chairman and other department members. Insofar as possible, the two visits to an Institute were arranged so that they occurred near the beginning and the end of an Institute, though the first and last weeks were ordinarily avoided on the theory that these would not be representative periods. Insofar as possible, also, visits were arranged so that the two Evaluators of an Institute varied in their professional training and geographical background. After each visit a report was sent to the Chief Investigator on 122 half-sheets, each dealing with a major item on the checklist.

Step 4. Preliminary Evaluation of the Institutes

This evaluation in outline form was prepared by the Chief Investigator from the individual reports sent to him by the Evaluators. The report was mailed to the Evaluators before the second conference.

Step 5. Second Staff Conference

This conference was held in the Americana Hotel, Miami Beach, November 19-21, 1962. The following items were on the agenda:

a. Discussion of the preliminary evaluation. The group discussed each item at length and came to general agreement on approximately 200 major and minor aspects of the Institutes.

b. Preparation of checklists to be used in visiting high schools in which Institute participants teach. One of these checklists was to be used in interviewing the participant, the other in interviewing the participant's principal or superintendent. (See Appendices E and F.)

c. Preparation of a questionnaire to be filled out by the participants visited. (See Appendix G.)

d. Agreement upon a schedule for the visits. (See Appendix H.)

After this conference the Chief Investigator refined the checklists and questionnaires and, together with report forms, had them mimeographed and distributed to the Evaluators.

Step 6. Follow-up Visits to the High Schools

Between December 15, 1962, and March 5, 1963, the evaluation staff visited 64 participants to observe the immediate effects of the Institute training on high-school teaching. The participants represented all Institutes except one, which was omitted because of distance and expense. Small as well as large high schools were visited, rural as well as urban. The normal visit consisted of an Evaluator staying at the high school for a full day, attending classes taught by the participant, interviewing the participant and his principal and/or superintendent, and, when possible, talking with students. After completing his visits, each Evaluator sent his reports to the Chief Investigator on 37 half-sheets, each dealing with a major item on the checklist.

Step 7. Semi-final Report

This report was written by the Chief Investigator from the preliminary evaluation and from the information gathered by the Evaluators during their visits to the high schools. It was mimeographed and distributed to the Evaluators for their comments and suggestions.

Step 8. Final Report

This report has been prepared by the Chief Investigator, and is based on the semi-final report and the critiques of it submitted by the Evaluators.

ANALYSIS OF THE DATA AND FINDINGS

For the analyses and evaluations that follow, the primary sources of information were (a) publications of the Commission on English of the College Entrance Examination Board, (b) reports by the Evaluators of their observations while visiting Institute classes and workshops, (c) reports by the Evaluators of their interviews during the Institutes with staff members, participants, and members of the several Departments of English, (d) questionnaires filled out and returned by 809 of the 868 participants at the 20 Institutes, (e) reports by the Evaluators of their observations in January and February, 1963, while visiting the high-school classes of 64 of the 868 participants, (f) reports of the Evaluators of their interviews with these 64 participants, their administrators, and some of their students, and (g) questionnaires filled out and turned in by all of the 64 participants visited. The analysis has seven main divisions: Aims, Staff, Participants, Curriculum, Diagnostic Tests, Physical Characteristics and Arrangements, and Immediate Results.

Aims of the Institutes

Through each of its major services--summer institutes, kinescopes, teaching materials, sample syllabi, and brochures for the public and the profession--the Commission on English has been attempting ever since its creation in 1959 "to improve the teaching of English in America's schools and colleges." Without a doubt, the 1961 Summer Institute Program was the most dramatic means devised by the Commission to achieve this broad goal.

A statement of the specific goals for these Institutes appeared in the Commission's brochure describing the Program:

> First, it [the Commission] hopes to improve the academic preparation and teaching skills of 900 carefully selected teachers of English. This improvement should come from informal contacts among the teachers, as well as from the courses and workshops of the Institutes. The Commission frankly hopes that these teachers will recognize the summer institute as an essential form of professional training and will become missionaries for it in their own communities.
>
> Second, it hopes to amass samples of excellent teaching materials appropriate for college preparatory classes in grades 9-12. These data will be published by the Commission.
>
> Third, it hopes to engage university faculties more actively and more realistically in teacher training.
>
> Fourth, it hopes to prove the feasibility of similar institutes, supported by grants from foundations or from the Federal government, beginning in 1963. The College Board cannot guarantee financial support for this project beyond 1962, but it can and will provide a tested model and develop potential leaders.

Taken as a whole, these objectives make excellent sense. They are succinctly stated, few in number, and not so visionary as to be unrealizable. They are clearly means toward that broader objective of the Commission to upgrade the teaching of English in the nation's schools. What is more, they are objectives that the great majority of the participants accepted enthusiastically. Only a minority had reservations about them; most of these wanted heavier weight given to the improvement of teaching skills.

The first aim--to improve the academic preparation and teaching skills of the participants--was the crucial objective, or more accurately, the crucial objectives since two matters were involved. Although those who planned the Institutes may have blurred their intent somewhat by compressing two aims into one statement, they showed only the highest vision in adopting both. By so doing, they set the program apart from a normal graduate program in English in which there would have been little interest in the participant as a teacher, and from the usual summer workshops in which there would have been little attention to the participant as a cultivated human being. In essence, their proposal was that the Institute program was to be at once theoretical and practical, academic and vocational, personal and professional. More than this, through means built into the program, the planners proposed to interrelate these complementary ends. This broad concept of the function of the Institutes was both sound and imaginative. If it was also overambitious, in the sense that the planners expected that the participants would greatly improve their academic preparation and their teaching skills in a single summer session, the error was at least on the side of the angels.

There is no doubt that the improvement in both areas was substantial. The papers, the tests, and the observations of the Institute staffs and of our own group of Evaluators all testify to this. As a whole, the Institutes were especially successful in contributing to the intellectual growth of the participants. Even the participants sensed this, for their collective judgment was that the Institutes had contributed to their intellectual growth "greatly" but to their skill as teachers only "moderately." This judgment was evident particularly in the responses of the participants interviewed on the follow-up visits. They were asked to rate the contribution of the Institutes to their intellectual growth and to their skill as teachers:

	Intellectual Growth	Skill as Teachers
Very Greatly	14	6
Greatly	27	19
Moderately	15	26
Little	4	8
Very Little	3	2

Despite the imbalance indicated by this table, both objectives should definitely be retained by those planning future institutes. Not to include them would be to lose the scope, the comprehensiveness, and, indeed, the great source of vitality of the 1962 CEEB Institutes.

The second aim--to amass samples of excellent teaching materials--is one that might be profitably eliminated as an objective for future institutes. The Commission had a special and laudable aim--to collect materials that could be duplicated and passed out to English teachers across the country so that the happy consequences of the Institutes could be many times multiplied. In some respects it must be admitted that the effects of this aim upon the Institutes was salutary. It caused Institute staffs to give sober thought to their workshops, the one feature that many staff members would have preferred to forget. It motivated the participants to a level of activity that they probably would not otherwise have achieved. (Many of them felt obligated to turn out teaching materials as a kind of quid pro quo for their $350 stipend.) It forced conferences between instructors and participants, and it led to useful discussions among participants themselves. At best it resulted in individual and group projects of some freshness and promise. And, of course, there was the desired flow of materials to the Commission office.

Nevertheless, these results were achieved at a considerable cost. The pressure to produce for an unknown audience created tension among the participants. There was some uncertainty about what the Commission wanted; there was fear lest the local Institute not show up well compared with other Institutes; there was a tendency to stress quantity instead of quality, the impressively broad project instead of the finely focused one. What seemed most regrettable, however, was the general reluctance to use the workshops for a discussion of points that had come up in the courses, for a sharing of ideas, for a questioning of methods. Instead, there seemed to be the feeling that one should constantly be doing something that would lead to mimeographed sheets. At worst, this feeling led to a frenetic busy-ness that sapped the students' vitality and caused them to skimp their course assignments.

The third objective was to engage university faculties more actively in teacher training. It would be incorrect to say that all of the Institutes failed in attempting to achieve this aim because some of them did not really attempt it. And certainly most of them did not achieve it in an immediate and clearly apparent way. Very few of the English departments involved seemed, at the time, to consider the Institutes an important departmental enterprise. In five departments even the chairman seemed indifferent. Occasionally, our Evaluators encountered members of English departments who were not even aware of the presence of an Institute on their campus. Quite obviously, few of the 20 departments involved had made the Institutes a matter of departmental business in which the entire department voted to grant graduate credit for Institute work and therefore felt some responsibility for its success.

Yet there were encouraging developments. Those members of English departments who taught in the Institutes developed a tremendous enthusiasm for the project. Some experienced almost an epiphany, a realization that an English professor can successfully engage in something related to teacher training. This realization is bound to spread. The interest in teacher training indicated in December, 1962, at the Allerton House conference of some 80 chairmen of Departments of English was certainly due in part to the Institutes. And the fact that over 20 other institutes have subsequently been planned and administered by Departments of English rather than by Schools of Education indicates that the 1962 Institutes piqued the curiosity of English faculties more than our Evaluators could detect during their 1962 visits. Best of all, perhaps, the Institutes in many instances managed to get professors in English and Education talking and planning together, both during and since the summer of 1962. In short, the third objective is a valuable one which is well worth retaining by future institute planners.

The fourth and last aim--to prove the feasibility of similar institutes, supported by grants from foundations or from the Federal government, beginning in 1963--needs no extended comment. Clearly, the 1962 Institutes merit imitation. Combining the theoretical and practical and bringing into play the three disciplines with which every English teacher must deal, the CEEB format is comprehensive and yet reasonably well focused. For both staff and participants, the work load was demanding but not necessarily backbreaking. And it was clear that the stipend of $350 plus remission of tuition was generous enough to attract a great many teachers. But it was not clear that it was sufficiently generous to attract the highly influential kind of teacher that the Commission most hoped to reach. Thirteen Institutes did not fill their quota of 45, although most of these had 43 or 44. Only a few Institutes had applications in sufficient number to allow some precision in selecting the kind of teacher wanted.

Without a doubt, the Commission demonstrated that it has an appealing and useful format for a summer program. If those planning future institutes are willing to accept such teachers as apply, they may fill their quota with the offer of a modest stipend or, indeed, with the offer of no stipend at all. But if they are trying to reach the most influential teachers in their area, they will need to provide a stipend sufficient to cover all living costs. Applications for grants to foundations or to the Federal government should be made out with this warning in mind.

On the whole, our Evaluators felt that the Institutes achieved their aims moderately well though not with uniform effectiveness. The following table indicates the distribution of Institutes by the Evaluators according to their effectiveness in achieving each of the four aims.

		Excellent	Good	Average	Fair	Poor
1.	To improve academic preparation and teaching skills	2	8	9	1	0
2.	To amass teaching materials	0	7	7	5	1
3.	To engage university faculties in teacher training	3	2	7	6	2
4.	To prove the feasibility of similar institutes	(Well demonstrated by all Institutes)				

Staff

The blueprint for an Institute staff called for a director, three course instructors, a workshop supervisor, and a follow-up instructor who would give half-time in the fall to visiting participants in their classes. In no Institute, however, did such a blueprint result in the assignment of six different men to Institute service. Fourteen of the directors, for example, also taught a course; and only two Institutes had workshop supervisors who were not also directors or course instructors. Also, in almost all Institutes the follow-up instructor had been a director or a course instructor.

Director. Among other duties, each director was responsible for planning his own Institute within the guidelines laid down at the 1961 planning session, overseeing its operation, taking care of physical arrangements, and briefing the staff and participants on objectives, procedures, and activities. Only two directors appointed their own staffs; eleven collaborated with the chairman of the Department of English; seven had little or no voice in such appointments. In all Institutes the director was a member of the Department of English of the host university. Seventeen had no classes outside the Institute though they were on call for thesis reading, committee work, and other departmental chores. Fourteen, as mentioned above, taught a class in the Institute.

Only six directors had any secondary teaching experience. Only one said a director really needed high-school experience; seven said it might possibly help, though they were not sure; ten felt it was unnecessary. All agreed, however, that the director should have had some contact with the secondary schools or should be familiar with the problems of secondary teachers.

As a group, the directors were both able and dedicated. They worked hard and earnestly, and the Institutes ran with a considerable degree of efficiency. Falterings in operation were by no means always attributable to the director. In several instances the director had not been granted authority consistent with his responsibility. Even the participants in one Institute noticed that the real head of the Institute was the head of the English Department. Some directors were overworked and could not give sufficient time to the Institute because the departments asked too much of them. Several of those who taught as well as directed found that the course demanded so much of them that administrative details had to be neglected. Many had too little clerical help.

There were lapses in operation, however, that were manifestly due to directors. Two or three of them simply disliked administrative detail and slighted it. More than half failed to brief the instructional staff and the participants sufficiently on aims, procedures, and coming events. It was apparent in several classes that neither the instructor nor the class knew, for example, the time for the next meeting of the workshop or what was being done with the diagnostic test results. One major difficulty was that the directors either had too few staff meetings or relied too heavily on informal luncheon discussions. Most of the directors failed to emphasize at the very beginning that the courses were to operate as regular graduate courses and would not deal with teaching methods, that methodology would be considered only in the workshop. This point needed to be hammered home with the utmost force since the brochure had blurred it somewhat in crowding the two major objectives into one statement. But it especially needed to be hammered upon because, through past experience, the participants had come to expect that summer workshops and institutes in English would deal extensively with methodology. On almost every campus there was some confusion and resentment concerning what the courses should be doing. While the instructor kept to the content of the course, many of the participants sat restively in their seats waiting for suggestions about teaching techniques. Any amount of silly and wasteful grumbling could have been avoided had the directors made it crystal clear in recruiting applicants and in the first class meetings that the courses were not to be concerned with methodology.

Possibly the most serious lapse of the directors was that they failed, on most campuses, to coordinate the assignments in the three courses with one another and with the projects in the workshops. Too often the participants were subjected to a barrage of uncoordinated assignments that even the most conscientious student could not handle successfully. Over two-thirds of the participants complained that their work load was "too heavy" or "much too heavy." The complaint was not a captious one.

In the best run Institutes--and there were four that were superbly run--the director was a talented scholar and an able administrator; he was friendly and informal, both with his staff and the participants; he had authority consistent with his responsibilities; he was freed by his department of almost all obligations except the Institute; he attended the classes frequently; he had regular meetings with his staff; and he had at least a half-time secretary. Whether or not he taught a course seemed not to make much difference. Nor did it seem essential for the director to have had teaching experience at the high-school level so long as he had some familiarity with high-school curricula and a sympathetic understanding of the high-school teachers' attitudes. To be successful, a director did not have to be a demigod, but he did have to be a capable man who was willing to dedicate all of his abilities for the time being to the Institute.

On efficiency in administration the Evaluators rated the Institutes as follows: excellent - 4, good - 7, average - 6, fair - 2, poor - 1.

Instructors. The instructional staffs were normally selected by the chairman of the Department of English, usually but not always with the advice of the director. Thirteen of the instructional staffs had at least one member who was an extramural appointment. The great majority of the instructors were members of Departments of English. Four, however, were English-Education specialists, and four were high-school teachers. Sixteen of the university faculty members, at one time or another, had had teaching experience in high school.

Plainly, the instructors were chosen with care. Many of them were among the best-known members of the profession; all of them had either a national or a local reputation for their contributions to the profession, either in teaching or in publication or in both. What is more, the instructors were unusually motivated to do superior work. They had met together in Ann Arbor in the summer of 1961 and there had agreed on the courses they would teach; they had had a full year in which to perfect the courses; and they knew that their work would be observed and evaluated by the CEEB Commission on English. It is not surprising, therefore, that the teaching in the Institutes was a cut or two above university teaching generally. Especially impressive in most classes were the freshness of the material, the careful organization of its presentation, the constant probing for student observations and reactions, the helpful use of the blackboard and mimeographed examples, and the friendly rapport between instructor and class. Much of the teaching in the Institutes was just about as effective as teaching can be, given a class of 45 and a hot summer. Interestingly, the teaching did not seem noticeably more effective in those classes which were divided in half so that the instructor faced 22 instead of 45.

But as exciting as some classes were, others were only tolerable, and a few were downright dull. Roughly a third of the instructors seemed only average or below average as teachers, including some who had scholarly and pedagogical publications of considerable distinction to their credit. Many of the weaknesses were the ordinary ones: too high a level of generalization, wordiness, irrelevance, an inability or a disinclination to solicit ideas from the participants, and a disheartening lack of direction. A weakness specific to the teaching in the Institutes was a failure to adapt to the level of the participants. In some instances (especially in the

Composition course), the instructor irritated the participants by grossly underrating their capabilities; in other instances (especially in the Language course), the instructor bewildered the participants by overrating them. In either case, there was a breakdown in rapport that seriously interfered with the learning process. More than a few participants complained that instructors were condescending toward them and were unavailable for consultation.

As one would expect, the most effective staffs were those in which all three members were both able scholars and forceful and imaginative teachers. More than this, though, the most effective staffs were those in which all three members recognized the special sensitivities of the experienced English teachers they had as students and adjusted their teaching accordingly. It seemed to enhance a staff's effectiveness if one of the three instructors was from another campus and if at least one (possibly the same person) knew high-school work intimately. What did not seem to make much difference were such matters as age, sex, years of experience, or bibliography. Liveliness was important, as were friendliness and a clear sense of dedication to the Institute and its participants. At the risk of stating the obvious, it should be said that no Institute can really prosper unless all of the instructors are topnotch. If these Institutes failed to live up to their sponsors' expectations, it was surely in part because the typical Institute had only two superior teachers instead of three.

Toward the end of the Institute sessions, approximately 800 participants rated their instructors as follows:

	Brilliant	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	Very Poor
Literature	22%	38%	20%	11%	7%	2%
Language	13%	39%	24%	10%	10%	4%
Composition	16%	37%	23%	13%	8%	3%

The ratings of the 64 participants interviewed in the follow-up visits differed somewhat but not dramatically:

	Brilliant	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	Very Poor
Literature	17%	34%	22%	16%	6%	5%
Language	14%	40%	17%	8%	13%	8%
Composition	14%	48%	17%	13%	6%	2%

Using a different scale, the Evaluators rated the instructors slightly more generously:

	Excellent	Good	Average	Fair	Poor
Literature	6	7	5	2	0
Language	2	11	5	2	0
Composition	2	8	7	3	0

Workshop Supervisor. Only two Institutes had workshop supervisors who were not also serving as course instructors or directors. In the others, workshop activities were supervised by the director, by the director and one or more of the instructors, or by one or more of the instructors. Sometimes it was hard to tell *who* was supervising a workshop. Participants needed more and better guidance than they received. There were too few supervising the workshops who understood both the philosophy of the Institutes and the day-to-day problems of the secondary-school teacher. It may have been the major weakness of the Institute staffs that they operated the workshops with their left hands.

The best directed workshop was one in which the supervisor had the workshop as his sole Institute responsibility. He set up a clear schedule of activities and met with the participants in a single group, in small groups, and individually. Since he taught in high school, he knew the practical problems faced by the participants; and since he had attended planning sessions and regularly attended summer staff sessions and Institute classes, he knew and was sympathetic with the aims of the Institute. It is hard to see how a successful workshop supervisor could do less and still fulfill his function. In some ways, a workshop supervisor is the key member of a staff. Yet by nature of his position, he must be skilled in effacement rather than aggrandizement. If there can be a paragon on a staff, it should be he.

Follow-up Instructor. The functions of the follow-up instructor were "to help evaluate the effectiveness of the workshop materials and to help the teachers develop new materials for classroom use." In almost every instance he was the director of an Institute or an instructor who had helped supervise the workshop. Our group of Evaluators, of course, did not observe any interviews between participants and CEEB follow-up instructors, but we did talk with about 50 participants who had already been visited by them. Our judgments are based, therefore, upon the testimony of these participants.

A few of them felt that their work had been substantially helped by the visits. The follow-up instructor had not only reinforced points made during the Institute but had suggested other techniques worth trying. Three or four were especially grateful because the follow-up instructor had talked to administrators, other teachers, and even the students. But most of the participants testified that although the visits were pleasant, they were not especially valuable. Their main contention was that the follow-up instructors did not know enough about high-school work to analyze their problems and make useful suggestions about techniques and materials. Two participants said explicitly, and a number intimated, that the visits were more useful to the follow-up instructor than to the participant since they enabled him finally to see what high-school teachers must face!

All of this indicates that the follow-up instructor should be something more than a friendly fellow who assures the high-school teacher that the university is still interested in him. He must know enough about the teaching of English in the high schools to be of some practical help. If possible, he should be the institute's workshop supervisor since only he can ordinarily be in a position to check on the specific ways in which the participant is carrying out the plans formulated in the institute.

The idea of a follow-up visit has sufficient merit to be retained by those sponsoring other institutes. But unless two visits are planned, the one visit should not come so soon after the adjournment of the institute as the CEEB visits came. At least it should not come so soon if the purpose of the visit is to check on the impact of the institute. Participants cannot modify their own methods and courses in two or three months, let alone effect any important change in the curricula, courses, or materials of their colleagues or of their school system. Ideally, there should be at least two visits: one early in the fall after the institute to help the participant with his plans, the other a year later to see how the plans are developing and to measure the effectiveness of workshop materials.

For their overall effectiveness, the Evaluators rated the Institute staffs as follows: excellent - 3, good - 10, average - 4, fair - 2, poor - 1.

Participants

The Institutes hoped to enroll 900 and actually enrolled 868. Quantitatively, therefore, they did very well. Apparently, the most effective kind of publicity was a letter accompanied by a brochure sent to school boards, superintendents and principals, department heads, and, most importantly, to the English teachers themselves. When polled, 532 of the participants said they learned about the Institutes through letters and/or brochures sent to their home schools. Other sources of information prominently mentioned were: professional journals - 84, newspapers - 39, the National Council or state or local councils - 34, other professional organizations - 20, the CEEB or Commission on English personnel - 19.

Qualitatively, the Institutes did well too. Every Institute had its screening committee consisting basically of the Institute director and his staff. Additional members in some Institutes included such persons as the Summer Session director, the chairman of the Department of English, a representative of the state's Department of Education, and an authority on the high schools in the area. For purposes of screening, these committees required applicants to send in a completed application blank together with academic transcripts, letters of recommendation, and a statement by the proper administrative officer promising to give the applicant a free hand to experiment in his classes. Some committees even demanded an original essay. In addition to employing their own criteria in the screening process, each committee respected the injunctions of the Commission on English that they put together an Institute group consisting of:

1. Teachers with at least three, but preferably five years' experience in teaching secondary-school English.
2. Teachers who look forward to ten or more years in the classroom.
3. Teachers whose principal assignments are in college preparatory English.
4. Teachers with the equivalent in subject matter courses of a full or nearly full undergraduate major in English and with an academic record that gives promise of success in graduate study.

5. Teachers who pledge themselves not to take additional courses during the summer term.

6. Teachers in schools that regularly send a substantial portion of their graduates to college.

7. Teachers who have the endorsement of their administrators and the assurance of support to carry out the Commission's program.

That these screening committees worked well is partly attested by the fact that only 14 of the participants who began the work of an Institute failed to finish it. From various statistics gathered by the Evaluators, the following "average" participant emerges: he (or she) was 39 years old; as an undergraduate he had been an English major; he had earned an A.B. degree and 16 hours of graduate credit; he had taught for eight years at the secondary level; he taught in a school enrolling about 1,000; he had classes in which a strong majority of the students planned to go to college, though only slightly over half of the school's graduates went to college; he was a member of NCTE and one other professional organization; he had attended previous summer institutes or workshops; he had his administrator's promise that he might experiment in his classes during the year after the Institute. Such a profile indicates a mature and professionally-minded participant. And so most of them were. In class they appeared to be more perceptive than other high-school teachers taking summer courses, and much more interested in their academic program. In short, their abilities were considerable and their motivation high.

But broad generalizations about 868 participants fail to give the full picture. The differences were great, for the range was from the brilliant to the dull. And the differences among the Institute groups were also great. In one Institute the participants were lively, articulate, and clearly eager to learn; in another not too many miles away they were subdued, relatively inarticulate, and occasionally antagonistic to learning.

Some of the groups developed cohesion in the first week; one never did develop it.

Why there should have been such marked differences in groups is a bit puzzling. From all that our Evaluators could gather, the 20 staffs applied the criteria for selection recommended by the Commission with comparable rigor. Geography seemed to make no difference; neither did the density of population of the area nor the incidence of commuting. The number and nature of the extra-curricular activities seemed not to be especially important either, though get-acquainted receptions were definitely helpful. Possibly there were three major causes for the differences. One was the number of applicants. The sifting committees that could select their groups of 45 from more than a hundred applications were able to assemble more promising groups than those that had to take almost everyone who applied in order to fill their rolls. A second cause for the differences probably lay in the leadership of the staff. Some directors and instructors had the knack of getting their groups to work together enthusiastically; others either did not have the knack or did not try hard enough. A third cause surely lay in the personalities of the participants themselves. Several of the Institutes were simply lucky in drawing persons who worked together well and had a good time doing it. It is hard to see how this last condition can be deliberately planned, but the other two may. Through publicity, generous fellowships, a distinctive program, a staff of national reputation, and wisely chosen criteria for selection, the sponsors of an institute should attempt to attract at least two or three times the number of applicants they can accept. Under such conditions, the participants selected are not only likely to be better academic risks, but they are also likely to be better motivated because they know they have survived a rigorous sifting process. Furthermore, the sponsors should select a director who is not only intellectually but also temperamentally equipped for the position. He does not have to be a glad-hander, but he has to have a modest amount of energy and he must believe in the importance of high-school English and high-school English teachers. The chief reason for the failure of one CEEB group to work together successfully was quite obvious: the director was too lofty.

In the follow-up interviews, the participants distributed themselves as follows in rating their fellow students: excellent - 22%, good - 59%, average - 17%, fair - 2%, poor - 0%.

The Evaluators' appraisal of the groups by Institute was as follows: excellent - 1, good - 11, average - 7, fair - 1, poor - 0.

Curriculum

The curriculum of the Institutes consisted of three courses--Literature, Language, Composition--and a workshop. The format won an overwhelming endorsement from both the staffs of the Institutes and the participants. And well it should have. It included graduate training in the three disciplines in which an English teacher must develop sophistication, and it provided an opportunity for the participants to translate this graduate training into the practical work of the high-school classroom. While there is a place for the more specialized institute--one, for instance, in linguistics alone--it is hard to see how the CEEB format can be improved upon if one is attempting to provide a rounded training within a single summer session. Our Evaluators were unanimous and enthusiastic in approving the design of the curriculum. Whatever reservations they had were concerned with the operation of the several parts. The discussion that follows, therefore, will be of the three courses and the workshop considered separately.

The Literature Course

The aim of the Literature course was "to increase the teacher's knowledge of what is involved in the close reading of a literary work." To this aim the instructors closely adhered. Although extrinsic considerations occasionally entered informally into the class discussions, there was little or no formal attempt to include them. The classes in all Institutes followed the syllabus closely; they began with an examination of poetry and then moved to fiction and drama. Matters of primary interest were genre, point of view, structure, meaning, and mode. Subsidiary elements that received especial stress were imagery, figures, symbols, irony, paradox, diction, and syntax. There was much fruitful discussion in all 20 classes about what will "open up" a text for the reader so that he can read with greater pleasure and understanding. Any deviations from the prescribed plan were minor--the substitution of one major work for another ("The Rime of the Ancient Mariner" instead of "The Rape of the Lock," Hamlet instead of King Lear), the reduction of the number of pieces studied, an allotment of extra time to poetry, and a reduction in the number of required papers.

The Evaluators felt that approximately half the written assignments in the Literature course were "excellent" or "good." Required papers included, for example, the discussion of a poem in relation to the poet's philosophy, comparison of two works with similar themes but from different genres, analysis of the imagery of a sonnet, differences and similarities between conceptions of maturity implicit in The Catcher in the Rye and

Lord Jim, analysis of the function of subplots in King Lear, analysis of one of several suggested image clusters in King Lear. One excellent technique used in many Institutes was the assigning of papers to be written for both the Composition and Literature courses.

The participants gave their overwhelming endorsement to the Literature course. The 809 who responded to a poll taken toward the end of the session disclosed that they averaged 20 hours a week on the course; 78 percent found the emphasis on close analysis "fully acceptable" or "acceptable"; 82 percent rated the organization and scope "excellent" or "good"; 81 percent thought the level of difficulty "about right"; 77 percent thought the course "extremely valuable" or "valuable" for their own education; and 58 percent rated its practical value for their own teaching either "extremely helpful" or "helpful." The 64 participants interviewed by our Evaluators in January and February, 1963, were still enthusiastic about the course though only 45 percent said that it had actually been "extremely helpful" or "helpful" to them in their teaching of literature during the first semester of the school year. (See Appendix I for a more detailed statement of statistics.)

There were many signs that the impact of the course was being felt in the classes taught by these participants, but possibly not so many signs as the Commission might have hoped for. Close to 60 percent reported that they had made no change in the organization of their work as a result of the course, though several in this group said that their courses were already organized for work in close analysis and a few others said that they planned to recommend changes when next their curriculum was up for study. Many pointed out that the effects of the course could best be seen not in any reorganization of their courses but in their stronger insistence upon careful reading. Yet here and there, organizational changes had already taken place. In order of frequency, the most important of these were a dropping or modifying of a strictly chronological organization in favor of the generic, more integration of the work in literature and composition, more use of contemporary literature, and a greater emphasis upon poetry. One participant said he was organizing the junior year around tragedy, and another mentioned that he was developing a seminar for ten gifted students.

When asked about materials used in their literature courses, 58 percent said that they had made no changes, though four in this group remarked that they had previously been using the kind of texts recommended in the Institutes. In order of frequency, some of the changes mentioned were the introduction of primary works studied in the Institute course, the introduction of critical materials studied in the Institute, the addition of more paperbacks (one participant persuaded his administrator to allocate $200 for books, chiefly paperbacks), the addition of more audio-visual aids, and a change in textbooks. What seemed most heartening was a discernible trend away from easy anthologies and "literature for adolescents" to more mature fiction, poetry, and drama.

About half of the 64 participants interviewed said that in classroom procedures they were spending more time having students analyze literary works in class, they were trying to ask more probing questions, they were giving more attention to the author's "voice" and to imagery, they were requiring more writing in class, and they were making greater use of panel discussions and oral reports. Many participants felt that the intellectual tone of their class work in literature had greatly improved.

Slightly less than half said they had made changes in their assignments in literature since returning from the Institute. In particular, they mentioned such changes as these: more assignments designed to elicit judgments rather than information, more assignments requiring criticism rather than description or biography, better focused assignments, more attention in book reports to matters of purpose and the means the author employs to achieve his purpose, and the use of assignments given them in the Institute course.

In short, what these follow-up interviews seemed to make clear was that about half of the participants were making no substantial attempt to change their teaching of literature because of their experiences at the Institutes. Yet it should be said that a sizable fraction of this group felt that no change was necessary because they had already been emphasizing what was stressed at the Institute. Others declared that they planned to make changes at a later date--and to recommend changes for their school system. So only about a fourth of the 64 participants interviewed seemed really to be resisting the methods and philosophy of the Institute course in literature, or to be indifferent to them. Many of these, however, felt that the course had been valuable for their own education. To put all of this more positively, a strong three-fourths of the participants, during and after the Institutes, felt that the Literature course was of great practical value to them.

They had good reasons for their enthusiasm. The direction of the course was clear; the works selected for reading and analysis were of the finest quality; and the teaching, while by no means uniformly excellent from Institute to Institute, was above the average for graduate classes. It is hard to see how any participant could have failed to discover new and important ways of reading a poem, a play, or a piece of fiction. The literature syllabus is one that might well be used as the basis for literature courses in future institutes.

Just a few criticisms of the content and teaching of the course seem to merit mention. One is that critical approaches other than the analytical should have been discussed and illustrated with their various advantages and disadvantages defined. The implication was much too strong in some of the classes that close analysis is the only really acceptable critical approach. Another comment is that the course might have profitably begun with fiction instead of poetry since secondary-school teachers tend to know more about fiction than poetry, and to be more knowledgeable and comfortable discussing it. As it was, the course started with the most esoteric instead of the most familiar material and, therefore, tended to be anticlimactic in effect, if not psychologically unsound in approach. A third point is that there should have been more significant use of bibliographies and of critical works. Although participants were asked to read critical essays, too little was done in most classes to incorporate ideas from these readings into the thinking of the class. And not nearly enough was done to advertise bibliographical aids that the teachers could use in preparing their high-school materials. In short, valuable as they were, the instructors' personal explications de texte consumed too much of the class time. Finally, textbooks commonly employed in freshman and sophomore courses should not have been used, as they were in some Institutes, since they pulled the course down to the undergraduate level.

The Language Course

The stated purposes of the Language course were (1) to make the teacher more aware of language as a field of study, (2) to show him the basic assumptions and methods of linguistics, and (3) to encourage him to undertake further study of linguistics and offer guidelines for that study.

In order to accomplish these aims the linguistics instructors agreed upon a syllabus that identified five areas of study: the nature of language and how it can be studied, phonology, grammar, varieties of language and usage, and historical changes in usage. To the extent that these five areas were touched upon in all 20 Language courses, it can be said that the instructors followed the syllabus. But that is about all that can be said. The instructors gave their own emphases to the course, often had quite different things to say about the new grammars, and employed their own teaching techniques, some of which were strikingly ingenious. The most notable difference was that some language instructors stressed structural grammar whereas others stressed generative grammar. Characteristic deviations from the syllabus included (1) spending more time than prescribed on phonology, (2) the introduction of a section on words and meaning--principles of lexicography, general semantics, stylistics, and (3) a change in the order of the areas studied.

The variety in course assignments can be indicated by listing a few that were characteristic: workbook exercises on phonology, morphology, and syntax; group projects resulting in one-page reports on specific items; study of reviews of the Third Edition of Webster's New International Dictionary; reports on usages in current magazines; panel discussions by participants on usage, grammar study, and words and meaning; the study of a passage of transcription in connection with the introduction to English phonology. Comparatively few of the courses required any formal writing; however, at least three language instructors assigned papers to be done in conjunction with composition assignments.

The participants (809 responding) reported that they averaged 15 hours a week on the course; 64 percent found the objectives of the course "fully acceptable" or "acceptable"; 65 percent thought the organization of the course "excellent" or "good"; 68 percent thought the level of difficulty "about right"; and 63 percent thought the course "extremely valuable" or "valuable" for their own education. But only 35 percent thought it "extremely helpful" or "helpful" to them as teachers. Roughly two-thirds of the participants, therefore, approved of the course in most respects; the other third varied from those who were mildly displeased to those who actively resented it. (See Appendix J for a more detailed statement of statistics.)

When our Evaluators interviewed 64 of these participants in January and February of 1963, well over two-thirds had kind things to say about the Language course. There was still a minority who complained that the course went so fast they could learn nothing well. Some felt that too much time had been spent on phonetics, that the course was disorganized, and that the instructor was too evangelical. Some were still downright resentful that the instructor had been so patronizing toward them because of their predilections for traditional grammar. But the great majority felt they had been given a broader and more accurate concept of what language really is. Those who previously had had some experience with structural or transformational grammar claimed that the course accelerated what one liked to call his "liberal tendencies." Many mentioned their gratitude for a sharper terminology, for excellent bibliographies, and for a stronger linguistic background. Most of those who still professed to be traditionalists were apologetic, maintaining that they were clinging to the old concepts only until they learned more about the new. A majority of the 64 interviewed said they planned to study more in the field, either by taking graduate courses or by reading on their own. One said the course so excited him that he might well specialize in linguistics. In short, these participants seemed to give the course a heart-warming endorsement.

When asked whether they had reorganized their courses in any respect as a result of attending the Institute classes, about 60 percent said that they had. They indicated such innovations as units on the history of the language, the levels of usage, etymology, dictionary study, and local dialects. Several said they were introducing elements of structural grammar into their courses; two, for example, said they were placing the stress on sentences instead of parts of speech. One was using phonemes in teaching spelling, another in teaching punctuation. One had developed a unit on the language structure of a poem; another had a series of lessons on the morphology in 1984. Several were reorganizing their courses to accommodate them to Roberts' Patterns of English. And one somewhat dazed gentleman said that he had eliminated all the units in his course involving a study of traditional grammar, but he wasn't quite sure what he had put in their places. Most of these course changes were slight, but it was probably too much to expect general reorganizations the first year after the Institutes.

Two-thirds of the 64 students interviewed said they had introduced new linguistic materials into their courses as a result of the Institute. For example, they reported that they had added textbooks by Roberts or Sledd or Newsome. A great many were using the materials given them in their Institute classes (though these materials were not intended to be so used). Some had developed analogous materials and had had them mimeographed. A few exhibited workbooks on sentence structure, phonology, morphology, and syntax which they said they had persuaded the schools to buy.

And two or three were having their schools purchase library books which had been listed on the bibliography distributed in the Institutes. One had managed to obtain tapes of dialect speech, and several more hoped to do so. And many referred to mimeographed exercises which they had used or planned to use. In short, new materials were being introduced. Several of our Evaluators remarked, however, that they were a bit dubious about some of the claims since they were never able to examine all of the materials that participants maintained they had introduced.

Half of those interviewed said they had changed their classroom procedures because of the course. They mentioned a variety of new class activities, only a few of which seemed fundamental. (Since many of the participants were master teachers before attending the Institutes, it is not necessarily a commentary upon the participants or the course that they made relatively few changes in their class techniques.) Among the new techniques mentioned were: having a class identify sentence elements by forms, having a class discuss sentences using the terminology of structural grammar, having panel discussions on the origin of language, using a more inductive approach in dealing with language phenomena, having a class make a language tree, using audio-visual materials for language study, having class discussions of nonsense sentences.

Slightly over half said they had changed their assignments because of the course in language. The range was from putting slightly less emphasis on parsing to persuading an entire department to adopt assignments based on the assumption that language is a separate discipline worth understanding for its own sake. Neither so trivial nor so sweeping were assignments involving, for example, the history of the language, structural analysis, diction, linguistic analysis of a newspaper or of a novel, and a field study of the local vocabulary. Some said they were eliminating assignments calling for diagramming and the identification of parts of speech. A good many said they would change the nature of their assignments as soon as they knew enough about linguistics to do so.

When the various testimonies of the participants are added to the observations of our Evaluators, several conclusions about the Language course emerge. The first is that the participants, as a whole, did profit--and profit greatly. Most of those who had been blindly authoritarian became less so, and those who had been more receptive to the newer linguistic approaches had their perspectives enlarged and their fund of information greatly increased. The second point is that they did not profit enough. The information they retained was often confused, and their attempts to translate it into classroom activities betrayed their uncertainty. The third point is that any achievement under the circumstances seems like a minor miracle. The syllabus required the instructors to compress a huge amount of complex material into as few as 24 class hours. The terminology of structural and transformational grammar was new to all but a few of the participants. And for most of the participants the material was new, difficult, and often antithetical to notions about language that they had been cherishing since childhood. Where there was strong resentment against an Institute, its source could usually be found in the Language course. One especially vocal grumbler told one of our Evaluators that he hadn't heard a word in the first three weeks of the Language course that he believed, and he was damned if he was going to believe anything he heard in the last three weeks!

Faced with difficult material and often semihostile students, many of the language instructors performed almost unbelievably well. At the expense of coverage, they limited themselves to what the class could absorb. To avoid confusion, they concentrated on one grammar--usually structural grammar--and kept largely to one textbook. Instead of preaching, they drew the conclusion they wanted from the class after close examination of illustrative materials. Some of these instructors were immensely witty. And best of all, they took into account from the first day that many of the participants would not be receptive to what they had to say. Even these instructors, however, were not emphatic enough in warning the students at the outset that the course was to enrich their own thinking and was not one in which--as far too many hoped--they would receive a series of ingenious little gimmicks that could be used to eliminate grammatical errors in high-school themes.

Several weaknesses should be especially noted. The focus should have been sharper and the coverage less. The attention to phonology, for example, should have been considerably less in view of the limitations on time. The linguists among our Evaluators felt that the course would have been better received if it had opened with syntax and moved to phonemics and finally to phonology. In some instances the classroom approach was poor. Instructors should have kept in mind the backgrounds and prejudices of their students; new grammatical concepts could not be rammed down their throats. The advantages and disadvantages of traditional grammar should have been explored before any discussion of a new grammar. Technical terminology should have been introduced slowly. There should have been no crusades. Demonstration was called for and not preachment. Finally, the assignments needed greater thought. No assignment should have been given that was not followed by a discussion in class; as it was, the many errors in student papers too often remained in the students' minds as truths. Despite all this, the Language course was an important and valuable experiment. It is no derogation of it to say that the reach of those who formulated and taught it exceeded their grasp.

The Composition Course

The principal aim of the Composition course was to help the participant become a better writer himself and a better critic of the writing of others. It attempted "to give a new experience and awareness that will increase the teacher's power to evoke good writing from his students, both by better directed assignments and by more accurate judgments of their writing." Since the composition experts attending the 1961 planning session could not agree on a single syllabus, they created two. The first was essentially subjective and experiential, stressing the role of the writer; the second was basically diagnostic, stressing the art of writing. The first syllabus was employed at Cornell, Harvard, Indiana, NYU, Penn State, Pittsburgh, Rutgers, Stanford, Tulane, and UCLA; the second at Albany, Duke, Michigan, Nevada, Ohio State, St. Louis, Texas, Washington, and Wisconsin. Southern Illinois developed a synthesis of the two syllabi. It would be difficult to prove that one Composition course was more effective than the other. Our Evaluators found the first more interesting because the material was fresher and, possibly, more substantial. Furthermore, the instructors clearly had a more messianic fervor: their voices were pitched a bit higher; their gestures were more abandoned; and their assignments were more ingenious. But there was no evidence that they urged their students to a higher pitch of creative activity or that the students were more grateful. Indeed, the participants from the other course seemed later to find that its approach and materials were more helpful teaching composition in high school.

The assignments, about half the time, were adjudged "excellent" or "good." Several of the especially promising ones required the participants to write a definition, an objective description contrasted with a subjective description, a joint paper with literature involving an analysis of a poem, and a joint paper with language involving an analysis of a local dialect.

The general assessment of the Composition courses by both groups was high. The participants reported that they averaged 18 hours a week on the course; 75 percent approved of the objectives; 69 percent rated the organization either "excellent" or "good"; 80 percent thought the level of difficulty "about right"; 73 percent rated its value for their own education either "extremely valuable" or "valuable"; and 64 percent thought the work "extremely helpful" or "helpful" in providing practical help for their high-school teaching. (See Appendix K for a more detailed statement of statistics.) Participants from both groups stressed that the work in composition had made them more aware of what constitutes good writing, had made them more sensitive to their own shortcomings as writers, and had contributed substantially to their professional growth. They felt that their standards had stiffened and that their classroom work had grown more rigorous. The participants who had been in the course emphasizing the role of the author were both more generous in their praise and more damning in their criticism. Those from two of the Institutes held that this was their most exciting course and that there was no disappointing feature about it. Those from three others were almost unanimous in saying that the course lacked direction, the discussions were often juvenile, the Phaedrus was discussed to the point of tedium, and the emphasis on voice became so ridiculous that the concept became the favorite subject of dormitory jokes.

At one Institute there was genuine appreciation for the time the instructor spent with the participants individually; at another the participants complained because the instructor was inaccessible. Comments from participants who had taken the course emphasizing the artistic product tended to be more general, but their comments also ranged from great praise to serious criticism, especially for the lack of clear direction. All of the participants interviewed from one Institute testified independently that they had come almost to worship their instructor, but they thought his course was useless!

From participant testimony and from their own observations, our Evaluators concluded that both courses were helpful and that neither had a clear edge over the other. Both succeeded in making the participants more aware of their own powers and limitations as writers. In so doing both contributed to their personal as well as their professional development. What seemed especially attractive in the courses were the high standards usually required; the emphasis upon the relation between the writer and reader; the insistence upon honesty, orderliness, and simplicity; the variety in the kinds of writing examined and assigned; the occasional hints about how writing and reading assignments may be profitably brought together in order to enhance the development of both skills; and the admirable demonstration on the part of many instructors of how a student essay may be rigorously and yet sympathetically criticized.

During the 64 follow-up visits, slightly over 60 percent from the course emphasizing the role of the writer and 48 percent from the course emphasizing the artistic product said they had reorganized their work, at least in part, since returning from the Institutes. Participants from both groups testified that they were placing more stress on expository and less on imaginative writing, that they were trying harder to integrate the work in composition and literature, and that they were giving more emphasis to composition generally. In addition, participants from the first group mentioned reorganization in order to give more weight to such matters as the speaker's relation to his audience, "voice," tone, style, and definition; those from the second group emphasized changes to give greater stress to such matters as purpose, introductions, paragraph organization, transitions, and deadwood.

Slightly less than 58 percent from the first course and 60 percent from the second said they had introcuced new teaching materials in composition, but the only widespread change seemed to be that they were using the exercises and mimeographed themes that had been handed out in the Institute classes. Interestingly, over twice as many from the second course as from the first were using Institute materials. A few, especially from the first course, said they had already changed their textbooks or planned to change them, and one said he had introduced the _Phaedrus_ as a text. Most participants, however, indicated that the really significant change was in their _use_ of materials rather than in the materials themselves. They maintained that their treatment of materials they had used before was sharper in such matters as voice and tone (first-course participants) and purpose, organization, and diction (second-course participants).

Of the participants from the course emphasizing the writer, 60 percent said they had made changes in classroom procedures; from the course emphasizing the written product, almost 70 percent said the same. Participants from both groups said they were making more use of mimeographed materials in class and hoped to be able to use an opaque projector. Both groups mentioned that they were having more class discussion and more close analysis in this discussion. Participants from the first course particularly mentioned experimentation with the Socratic method, with the integration in class of work in composition and literature, and with classroom conferences. Students from the second course mentioned experimentation with class analysis of themes, with class themes written under pressure of time, and with the grading of themes in class and by the class.

Two-thirds of the participants from the course emphasizing the role of the author maintained that they were changing their assignments; almost 80 percent from the course emphasizing the artistic product said the same. The changes attributed to the Institute courses by the two groups were almost precisely the same: they were assigning shorter and more frequent papers than before; they were placing greater emphasis upon expository writing; they were trying to focus their assignments more sharply and to make the statements of assignments more specific; they were attempting to vary their assignments more; having experienced the agony of having their own papers red penciled, they were reading their students' papers with more discernment and compassion; they were reading more for the overall effectiveness and less for mechanical lapses; and they were placing more emphasis upon marginal comments and less upon letter or numerical grades. One participant surely must have had his gears in reverse when he said that since the Institute--and presumably because of it--the English department of which he is head has drafted a list of penalties to assess in each grade level for theme errors.

As successful as they were, though, the Composition courses could have been better. There seemed to be no compelling reason for two courses. Whatever the issues that split the group in the 1961 planning session, there seemed to be none during the time of the Institutes that was irresolvable. To the extent that the courses differed, they were simply complementary. Each would have been enriched by material from the other. A good course in composition, it would seem, should deal both with the producer and the product, as the synthesis achieved in the Southern Illinois Institute demonstrated.

The standards in the Composition course needed to be a matter of greater concern. The moment an instructor nodded, the course slipped down to the level of freshman English--or below. To deserve graduate credit, this had patently to be an advanced course in writing. No textbook commonly employed in freshman English courses should have been used. Nor should assignments have been made that are commonly imposed on freshmen. The readings should have been only the finest in the fields of rhetoric and stylistics. These are dogmatic assertions, but they need to be made. There was a serious question in the minds of our Evaluators as to whether some of the Composition courses merited graduate credit. Even the participants sometimes complained that they were not being pushed hard enough.

Class meetings should have been reduced, if necessary, to make individual conferences possible. Many of the composition instructors divided their class of 45 into two sections and met them separately. Their argument was that they could not handle a subject so intimate and detailed as composition in sections of more than 23. Our Evaluators could see no profound improvement in the quality of the discussion in these smaller sections, nor did the participants seem to feel that there was great advantage in them. Indeed, it might be argued that there was a drop in spirit as students moved from the full group in Literature or Language to the smaller group in Composition. What was required more than the smaller section was the personal conference. The highest morale and the liveliest discussion occurred in an Institute where the 45 participants met in one group three times a week and otherwise met individually with the instructor. What made the Composition classes in this Institute all the more remarkable was that the participants, as a group, were not especially gifted.

The writing assignments should have been combined more frequently with assignments in literature and language. Although some staffs managed such integrated assignments often, others almost ignored the many opportunities to do so. The advantage of such assignments was that they not only gave the student something significant to write about but they also sharpened his awareness of the interrelations among the several disciplines.

In some Institutes, student papers needed to be commented upon with more regard for the especial sensitivities of the participants. Having criticized their high-school students for years, many participants were extraordinarily unprepared for criticism of their own work. With adroit suggestion they ought to have been--and often were--led to see their weaknesses and be grateful. Many of the composition instructors were the best liked in the Institutes. But some were also the least liked; invariably, these were the ones whose criticisms were offhand, patronizing, and needlessly insulting.

The Workshop

The workshop seemed to be a nightmare for the staffs of most of the Institutes. This was the one aspect of the Institutes that seemed not to have been worked out with care. Franker than some of the others, one director said he just wished the workshop would go away.

In theory the workshop was to be the capstone of the Institute. In the workshop the participants were to bring together the material from the three courses, integrate it, and apply it in working out lessons that they would then test in their own classes during the following school year. These laudable aims were achieved in substantial measure by a fair number of participants. But they were not achieved generally enough for it to be said that the workshop program as a whole was an outstanding success.

It is difficult and probably not necessary to describe the operation of the workshops in detail. There were 13 different workshop schedules in the 20 Institutes, varying from one that required only two rather short afternoon meetings a week to one that gave two weeks exclusively to workshop activities. In addition, there were at least 14 ways of organizing the workshops: everything from putting each participant on his own to dividing the participants into three large groups, one for each of the three disciplines. Such diversity, to be sure, does not necessarily indicate weakness, but in this instance our Evaluators came to feel that it did. The lack of uniformity in schedules and organization seemed to reflect a general uncertainty about the nature and function of the workshop program.

Nevertheless the workshops succeeded in bringing the participants together in relatively informal groups where they could share experiences and discuss their common professional problems. In the opinion of many participants, this was their most useful function. In addition, of course, the workshops resulted in the production of scores of projects and lesson plans worked out by the participants individually or in groups. Many of the simpler ones had already been tried out in high-school classes before our Evaluators visited the schools in January and February. Among the more ambitious and yet untried were a project in composition involving a

10-unit course curriculum and one in language calling for a sequential program in high-school linguistics. Undoubtedly, the most ambitious was the 200-page St. Louis "syllabus," a work which covered all three disciplines and attempted to outline a 4-year sequence of studies designed to emphasize academic interests--both literary and scientific--and prepare the student for college work. For each grade the syllabus stated aims, provided a course of study, listed typical works to be assigned, and included a few detailed plans with suggestions for applying the studies of literature, composition, and linguistics in a specific context. As the Commission on English had hoped, many of the workshop projects, like the St. Louis syllabus, managed to combine work in two and sometimes three disciplines; that is, a project in the study of, say, Crane's "Open Boat" might include provisions for making a lexical gloss and for writing a critical essay.

Despite their accomplishments, the bulk of the evidence indicates that the workshops fell far short of the hopes that the Commission had for them. The points of weakness were not hard to find; indeed, most of them were singled out for our Evaluators by the participants and by staff members as well. It should not be inferred from the following list of particulars that all of the workshops were weak at all of these points. Far from it. These were points of weakness, however, found commonly enough to bear mention. They should serve as warnings to supervisors in the future.

1. Objectives. The point has already been made that the results of the attempt by the Commission on English to use the workshops primarily for the amassing of teaching materials were not altogether fortunate. The workshop should have been less concerned with production and quantity, more concerned with the critical examination of concepts and procedures. It should have been, first of all, a forum where the group as a whole could evaluate what they had been learning, where they could think up interrelations among the disciplines and see their possibilities for high-school teaching and high-school assignments, where they could share ideas, techniques, and dreams that they had not had an opportunity to share in the courses. The workshop should have pulled the participants into a group engaged

in imaginative and constructive thought about their professional problems. Only secondly should the workshop have had the more practical objective of giving the participant practice in adapting the material and techniques and philosophy of the courses to his own high-school teaching. Whether he completed several--or any--projects or lesson plans was not so important as that he obtained supervised training in establishing high-level ends and means. Since most of the participants were experienced teachers, they already knew a great deal about designing lesson plans and devising useful teaching techniques. The emphasis with such participants, therefore, should have been on such matters as the articulation of parts in a cumulative and sequential curriculum, standards that assure intellectual respectability, material consonant with the desired standards, and the approaches best calculated to be effective with the particular material and the particular students.

2. Leadership. Much too often the workshop supervisor was grossly unsophisticated about high-school English. His sentiments were sound, but his advice was impractical.

3. Schedule. Many participants complained--and our Evaluators agreed--that when the courses and workshop operated concurrently, the schedule became much too heavy, even for the best students. Furthermore, the courses had far too little impact upon workshop projects when these projects had to be selected and organized while the courses were just getting under way. The best workshop was the one that got down to work only after the courses were completed.

4. Organization. What the CEEB participants complained about most bitterly was the lack of organization. Much too often, they did not know clearly where the workshop was heading, or what their particular obligations were. The result was that individually or in groups they themselves too often had to try to make sense out of what one participant called "chaos."

   How the participants were divided into groups for working on projects seemed not to be too critical a question. The participants approved and disapproved every kind of division. Some liked to work individually; others did not. Some liked to work in small groups; others felt there was too great a tendency for one person to dominate a small group. Some liked large groups; others felt too many shirked assignments in large groups. Yet it seemed to our Evaluators that the materials turned out by groups of about five showed slightly more imagination and a higher intellectual caliber than those produced by participants working individually. The weight of the evidence, such as it is, therefore, seems to suggest that for the practical activities of the workshops the participants might most profitably be divided into small groups.

5. Standards. Some of the materials coming out of the CEEB workshops were embarrassingly mediocre. Included among these were projects involving nothing more than methodological tricks, lesson plans derived from those the participants had previously used, and proposals that seemed to assume that the typical high-school student is a moron.

> In at least one Institute, some of the materials submitted had been copied in large part from textbooks. And some were so dreamily impractical that they were apparently written primarily to impress the instructor with their novelty. In short, there was in most Institutes an almost dramatic difference between the intellectual levels at which the courses and the workshop operated.

Integration of the Three Disciplines

One of the fondest hopes of the Commission on English was that the Institute staffs would not only teach graduate courses in the three disciplines, but would manage to integrate the three so that a composite--something we can properly call English--would emerge. Such integration was partly to be achieved in the courses through joint assignments, assignments that called two or three of the disciplines into play, constant references by each instructor to the courses being taught by the others, and so on. Primarily, though, the integration was to be achieved in the workshop where the participants were expected to select projects that would bring together at least two, and preferably all three, disciplines. Many plans produced in the workshops did so.

Generally speaking, however, the business of integrating the three disciplines seemed to be attacked half-heartedly. Too few suggestions about its possibilities appeared in the syllabi. Too little talk about it occurred at planning sessions. The assignments by the three instructors in an Institute were too seldom worked out together. Instructors visited one another's classes too rarely. Too few of the instructors had a lively awareness of all three disciplines. It was a rare Institute, for example, in which the literature and composition instructors really knew what the language instructor was doing. In some they suspected that they knew--and didn't like it.

The participants (797) rated the Institutes as follows for their usefulness in helping them to integrate their work in the three disciplines: extremely helpful - 8%, very helpful - 22%, helpful - 35%, slightly helpful - 25%, not at all helpful - 10%.

The Evaluators' appraisal of the success of the integration process by Institute was: excellent - 0, good - 0, average - 9, fair - 6, poor - 5.

Because the attempt to integrate the three disciplines seemed to create such thorny problems, our Evaluators had considerable discussion on the subject. If integration can be achieved at all, we finally felt, it can be achieved only by a staff in which each of the members has a lively awareness of all three disciplines. Furthermore, these staff members must plan their courses and the workshop together, plan their assignments together, plan their attack on student papers and projects together, and regularly visit one another's classes. These are the bare necessities for an institute designed to give the participants even a modest sense of how work in the three disciplines can be integrated.

But we had serious doubts about whether all this stress and strain are necessary. Frankly, we were not convinced that strong integration is a necessary aspect of the curriculum--or even that it is a realizable one. It would be pleasant, of course, to be able to demonstrate that English is a unified discipline rather than a congeries of disciplines. But no one has yet satisfactorily demonstrated that it is, and it does seem to be expecting too much to put the burden of proof on a 6 or 8-week institute. It is enormously helpful to point out as many interrelations as possible between and among the three disciplines, but this is something quite different from attempting to integrate them. In the end, therefore, our Evaluators felt that the Institutes were not to be criticized too harshly for not having managed to integrate the work in the three areas. Maybe they were searching for a chimera.

Ending this discussion of the curriculum with an evaluation of the workshops skews the total impression unfortunately. Valid in theory, they were unimpressive in practice. But they can easily be improved upon, and they should be kept as a necessary part of an institute designed on a broad scale to step up the competence of the high-school English teacher.

Evaluation of the Parts of the Curriculum by the Participants

The 64 participants interviewed in the follow-up visits were asked to rank the four parts of the curriculum for their intellectual excitement. According to their responses, the Literature and Composition courses were almost equally exciting; the Language course ran a respectable third; the workshop trailed very badly indeed. They were also asked to rank the four parts for their practical helpfulness. The Composition course won by a large margin; the Literature course was second; the Language course just managed to shade the workshop for third. (These rankings coincide with the questionnaire answers given by 740 of the participants during the Institutes. When asked which of the three subjects was given priority when they were pressed for time, 51 percent said composition, 33 percent literature, and 16 percent language.) It is worth noting that the workshop was ranked last even for its practical value. These participants also indicated that the required reading and classroom discussion were of almost equal value in contributing to their effectiveness as teachers, that the required writing was third most valuable, that informal discussion with participants was fourth most valuable, and that conferences with instructors were by a tremendously wide margin least valuable. The chief reason for the low opinion of conferences with instructors was that the instructors, except for a very few, did not hold any.

During the Institute sessions, 64 percent of 735 participants said they felt it had been wise to include all three areas in the Institute curriculum: literature, language, and composition. Those answering "no" indicated the following preferences for curricula:

Literature and Composition	150
Language and Composition	48
Literature and Language	33
Language alone	19
Composition alone	13
Literature alone	2

When asked if they would "relive" their Institute experience, knowing what they now know of the Program, a large majority (84 percent) of those interviewed in the follow-up said "yes." And 61 percent would do it--or so they said--even without subsidy.

Diagnostic Tests

There seemed to be a real question whether the Diagnostic Tests taken by the participants of the CEEB Institutes yielded information that was useful enough to justify their cost in money and time.

The Literature Test required the participants to read a Shakespearian sonnet ("When in the chronicle of wasted time") and to formulate several important questions about the language, structure, and meaning of this poem that they would expect to find answered in a critical essay on it. They were then to write a paragraph answering the question they thought most important. Many of the instructors felt that the results were inconclusive. The questions the participants formulated tended to be general

2

and obvious, and their paragraphs told more about their powers as writers than as critical readers.

In the Composition Test, the participants were provided with three student themes on that old chestnut of a theme topic, "My Summer Vacation." The participants were to write a concise paragraph evaluating each theme; they were to make such notations on the third theme as they normally would on one of their own student papers; and they were, in a paragraph or two, to indicate how the subject was in part responsible for the range in the quality of the three themes. The test did indicate something about the participant's discernment, his sensibility to form and content. And it revealed a good deal about his theme-reading techniques. But since it did not require any extended essay, it did not tell much about the participant's ability to select and organize material, or his power in writing anything more than a relatively brief paragraph. As a matter of fact, the Composition Test tended to indicate as much about the participant as a critical reader as it did about him as a writer.

The Language Test required the participants to answer 15 true-false items on varied aspects of usage and the history of the language, to set forth their attitude toward three statements on language change and usage, and to indicate the form and function of underlined elements in 27 sentences. What the test succeeded in doing was to reveal with some accuracy the participants' predispositions with respect to usage and to indicate their competence in naming grammatical units. But, like the other tests, it did not yield much information about the participants beyond what might have been guessed. Besides, some of the instructors disagreed with a few of the answers in the key and tended to lose faith in the test as a whole.

Taken together, the three tests indicated that the participants were less competent than the Commission on English had hoped they would be. As disclosed by the tests, their literary insights, on the average, were superficial, their writing pedestrian and imprecise, and their grammatical awareness limited. In revealing these facts, the tests performed what could have been a valuable service. But it was not apparent that the sights of instructors in any Institute were immediately adjusted downward, or that the syllabi were changed. In the Language course especially, the results on the test should have been a tip-off that the syllabus was keyed too high.

For many of the participants the tests, especially the Language Test, were a traumatic experience. A good number told our Evaluators that they were tempted to leave the Institute after taking the Language Test since they felt the work would be hopelessly beyond them. The situation might have been helped had the instructors talked about the tests in class, indicated their usefulness for the purpose of diagnosis, and reassured the participants that they were not expected to handle them with great ease. But few instructors did this. Undoubtedly the tests were of some use. But there was enough unhappiness about them among the participants and enough disregard of their results by the staffs to make one wonder whether they were worth the time and trouble.

Physical Characteristics and Arrangements

Size

As previously stated, the Commission on English recommended that the maximum enrollment for an Institute be 45. It also urged that, if possible, each enrollment be brought up to the maximum. Fifteen of the 20 directors and 9 of the 12 Evaluators agreed that 45 was a defensible number. They believed that a group of this size was large enough to give a sense of a lively and successful venture, and yet small enough to allow for profitable discussion in class. Also, they felt that at least this many participants were necessary if the impact of the Institute was to be strongly felt in the surrounding area. Apparently, the participants agreed since 56 of the 64 interviewed in the follow-up visits thought the size of the Institute "about right." Seven thought the enrollment "too large," and one thought it "much too large."

Some of the directors and Evaluators who approved of a group of 45 qualified their approval by saying that for the best class discussion the group should be divided into two sections. And five directors and three Evaluators advocated a smaller enrollment, pointing out that many classrooms were too small to accommodate 45 participants comfortably in hot weather, that there were too many participants for adequate classroom discussion and productive workshop activity, that the work load was too heavy for the composition instructors, and that there were too many participants for a thorough follow-up program.

The consensus was that 45 is a manageable group if the physical arrangements are adequate, if the composition instructor and workshop supervisor have no obligations for the summer session other than their institute assignments, and if it is possible at any time for an instructor to divide the group into smaller units for discussion or conference. Indeed, any enrollment between 20 and 45 seems large enough to justify the venture and small enough to be manageable.

Class Schedule

Most Institutes had morning classes and afternoon workshop sessions. There were almost as many different schedule patterns, however, as there were Institutes. Schedules for a single course per week included five 50-minute periods; three 2-hour periods; three 75-minute periods; five 75-minute periods; five 50-minute periods for language and literature, and three 50-minute periods for composition plus a conference at least once every 2 weeks. Except in those two Institutes that set aside 1 or 2 weeks for the workshops, workshop meetings ranged from two 2-hour sessions per week to five 2-hour sessions per week. One Institute, much against the desires of the participants, had no formal schedule for workshop sessions; participants worked on their projects at their own convenience, either individually or in small groups, and arranged conferences with the instructors as their projects progressed.

Length of Term

The terms of the CEEB Institutes varied: one was 5 weeks in length, fourteen were 6 weeks, and five were 8 weeks. In all but two of these the three courses and the workshop ran concurrently with the courses for the full length of the term; in one Institute a week toward the end of the term was set apart for the workshop, and in another an optional 2-week workshop came after a 6-week term for the courses. (See Appendix L for length of terms and credit granted.)

The 20 directors split evenly on the length of the term, 10 preferring a 6-week session and 10 an 8-week session. Of the participants queried during the follow-up interviews, 6 voted for a 4-week term, 35 for a 6-week term, and 21 for an 8-week term. The consensus of the Evaluators was that the ideal term for a successful institute is 8 weeks, the first 6 weeks for the three courses, and the last 2 weeks for the workshop. It should be added that they felt the workshop might profitably be organized during the 6 weeks allotted to the courses, though its formal program should not get under way until the last 2 weeks.

Work Load

There is no doubt that the participants found the work load taxing. If their responses on a questionnaire can be believed, over 75 percent of them felt that too much was being demanded of them. Doubtless this attitude was due in part to the fact that most had not had any formal graduate work for some time and were out of training. Few, even as graduate students, had had such a packed schedule. Also, many were unprepared for the pressure since workshops and conferences they had attended before tended to be relaxed affairs in which they shared their teaching experiences or simply listened to the so-called experts.

The participants were asked on a questionnaire to indicate the number of hours per week spent on the Institute (classes, reading, writing, and so on). Their responses varied from a wild 135 hours a week (which would leave less than 5 hours a day for everything else) to an equally wild 18 hours a week (which was 1 hour less than the 19 hours of classes in which the student participated). The more realistic students reported that they spent anywhere from 30 to 95 hours a week on the Institute, and the average was about 53 hours a week.

To a question about the work load 772 participants responded in the following fashion:

	During Institute	During Follow-up
Much Too Heavy	31%	6%
Too Heavy	47%	47%
About Right	21%	45%
Too Light	1%	2%
Much Too Light	0%	0%

The same attitude came out in their responses to the following question: "In view of what the Institute tried to do, what do you think about the length of the term?" A majority in the 5-week and 6-week Institutes indicated that there was too little time to do what was expected of them.

	Much Too Long	Too Long	About Right	Too Short	Much Too Short
Those who attended a 5-week Institute			2	3	
Those who attended a 6-week Institute		1	18	26	2
Those who attended an 8-week Institute		2	9	6	
Totals		3	29	35	2

Considering the Institutes as a whole, the Evaluators agreed with the participants who felt that the work load was too heavy. In their evaluation of the separate Institutes, however, they felt the work load in 10 was "about right," in 10 "too heavy." In large measure, the excessively heavy loads were due to the fact that there was little or no attempt to coordinate assignments.

Extra-curricular Activities

The extra-curricular activities most commonly provided by the Institutes were teas, receptions, luncheons, coffee hours, and lectures. In addition, the regular campus cultural and recreational activities were open to Institute participants, though the participants said they had too little time to take advantage of many of these. Most Institutes held from one to three activities, the most common being a get-acquainted social hour, a "relaxer" of some type midway in the session, and a farewell luncheon. One Institute had no extra-curricular activities, and another listed only evening lectures by English professors.

Many participants said that they would have liked more social gatherings since they felt they could have worked together better, especially in the workshops, had they been able to get to know one another better. Many also said that though they could see the advantages in extra-curricular activities they could not have taken advantage of many such activities because of their work schedule or because they commuted.

Library Facilities

The library facilities ranged from excellent to poor. In almost all of the Institutes the participants had privileges comparable to those of the regular summer school students, but these privileges were sometimes inadequate. Books that the participants especially needed were often not placed on reserve, and hence were not generally available. Even when they were placed on reserve there were ordinarily too few copies for 45 students. By far, the best arrangement seemed to be in those Institutes where the staff and the librarians had cooperated in putting together a special collection for the use of Institute participants. In at least one Institute this collection was housed in the room used by the Institute as its headquarters, and thus the books were available during most of the day and evening to all of the participants.

Classrooms

Most of the Institutes used classrooms that were regularly assigned them in classroom buildings, but several Institutes had a single room set aside for their exclusive use. In at least two universities the Institute had the most desirable room on campus for all of its classes. The single "Institute room" was a great advantage. Not only did it make the class day easier for the participants, but it resulted in intangibles such as a sense of greater security, a feeling of pride in the Institute, and high morale. There were justifiable complaints about classrooms assigned in some Institutes; they were too small, poorly lighted, and badly ventilated. In many Institutes the rooms were too hot; in one, because of an overactive air conditioning system, the room was much too cold. Nevertheless, the Institute classes were as well housed on all campuses as the regular summer courses, and on a few campuses they were much better housed.

The workshop quarters varied. One Institute used the room normally used by freshman English instructors for conferences with their students; another used rooms in the dormitory; another occasionally met in rooms on the second floor of the Faculty Club; another used the "Institute room"; but most simply used classrooms as assigned to them by the university registrar. Undoubtedly, the fact that, for its particular purposes, the workshop was not well housed on most campuses helped to build up the impression that, in the minds of the Institute staff, the workshop was something of an afterthought.

Housing and Dining

Dormitory facilities were on the whole quite adequate. In only one Institute did the participants complain of their accommodations--and with great reason. What the women participants especially liked was to have a wing or a corridor in a women's dormitory to themselves. Proximity in the dormitory made it possible for them to get together frequently on their assignments. The men participants seemed not to be so concerned about being housed together. But then there were fewer men who stayed in campus housing. Most married participants commuted since it was financially impossible for them to maintain two residences.

Participants were left to shift for themselves for meals. Most of those who stayed on campus ate in student cafeterias. There seemed to be no serious complaint about either the price or quality of the food. And most seemed to prefer eating where and when they pleased to the possible alternative of having Institute participants regularly eat together. There was some grumbling on one campus because the cafeteria was so far away from the dormitory.

On the whole, the participants felt that they were well cared for. On a questionnaire they were asked: "What are your reactions to the physical arrangements (housing, dining, classrooms, etc.)?" The responses of the 757 participants who replied to this question distributed themselves in this fashion: excellent - 48%, good - 40%, fair - 9%, mediocre - 2%, poor - 1%.

Immediate Results

The purpose of this section is to present some of the immediate effects of the Institutes as they were observed and reported by the Evaluators in the follow-up visits in January and February of 1963. Many of these effects, of course, were intangible--indeed, the most profound ones were probably intangible. For as one participant put it, "What I gained was a refreshment of spirit; I know I'm teaching better even if I can't be very specific about the changes I've made." Others spoke of an increase in professional pride, a greater concern for the future of English, a heightened conscientiousness about his daily tasks. One said he felt bolder about experimenting; another said he had decided to stay in English though previously he had determined to switch to guidance; many said that they were reading more, especially in the fields of linguistics and modern literature. Eight of the 64 interviewed reported that their experiences in the Institutes had encouraged them to continue with their graduate work. Asked to give an overall appraisal of their Institutes, 24 of 62 who responded in the follow-up interviews said they were "extremely valuable," 26 said they were "valuable," 8 said they had "some value," and only 4 said they had "little value."

The principals of the schools in which these participants taught gave similar testimony. Only a very few suggested that their teachers were partly disappointed: one said the participant came back tired; another said the participant liked all but one course; one reported that the participant was annoyed with the busy work; and three reported that the participants had mixed feelings. But 58 said the participants came back enthusiastic about the Institutes and "charged up" for the year's work. Even when it is granted that both the participants and their principals might be inclined to overstate the case to our Evaluators, the reactions were positive enough to be arresting.

The principals went on to endorse the Institutes themselves. Obviously, most of them were pleased that their teachers had attended them. In effect, 45 of the 64 interviewed agreed with the principal who called the Institutes "a tremendous idea." Of the others, three expressed mild approval, four felt the Institutes should have been for the average rather than the master teacher, one felt the Institutes tried to do too much, and one felt the work in two of the three classes was "out in left field." Four admitted they did not know much about the Institutes. More important, probably, than this overwhelming verbal endorsement was the fact that most of the administrators, as they had promised, gave the participants complete freedom to experiment in their classes with the ideas and materials of the Institutes. Only a very few participants reported that there were restrictions placed upon their experimentation. Such restrictions as they listed seemed not to be crucial: the cost of the experimentation must not be great; the basic textbooks must be used though supplementary works might be added; the general outlines of the approved curriculum must be followed. Only two participants said that their administrators strongly disapproved of any change.

What the administrators did not do was to advertise among parents and students that their teachers had attended the Institutes. Only six said that they had informed the parents, either by placing news items in the local papers or by announcements made at parents' meetings. Apparently, none had informed the students, though 10 said that they were sure that the students knew. One added that the students "couldn't care less where Mr. E----- spends his summer." Indeed, for all their enthusiastic approval of the Institutes and their support for curriculum changes in harmony with Institute philosophy, it was not altogether clear that the administrators knew or even cared about what was going on in the classes taught by the participants. When questioned, only 14 of the 64 could name any specific change that the teachers were making as a result of their Institute experience. These 14 mentioned projects in linguistics (5), projects in composition (2), team teaching (1), book ordering (1), revision of the entire English curriculum (4), and, oddly, lighter assignments (1). But 50 of the principals said they were unaware of any changes the participants were making, either in philosophy, materials, or techniques. For the most part, these administrators seemed satisfied with the knowledge that the participants had had the Institute experience and were showing what one called "a fresh vitality."

Both the principals and the participants themselves felt that other teachers in the school were impressed by the experience the participants had had at the Institutes. Of the principals, 37 said that their participants were viewed with greatly increased respect by their colleagues; five said they were viewed with respect tinged with envy. Of the participants, 41 believed that they were held in higher respect because of their Institute experience. Of these, seven said that they found themselves far more influential in departmental discussions than they had been before. Many said that because of their example their colleagues had become interested in attending institutes, chiefly for work in language and composition.

Taken as a whole, the participants were making use of their Institute experiences in a variety of ways. The changes they were making in their own classes have already been suggested in the section on Curriculum. (See pp. 30-32, 36-38, 42-44.) Although these innovations were scattered and often not especially fundamental, they were sufficient both in quantity and quality to be impressive. One must remember, too, that these were changes effected in the first semester after the attendance at the Institutes.

Outside their classrooms the participants were spreading the Institute gospel, too. Of the 64 participants interviewed in the follow-up visits, 16 said that they had reported on the Institutes at departmental meetings, 1 at a department chairmen's meeting, and 1 at a general faculty meeting.

What was more important, 11 had made their Institute materials available to other teachers, 5 were helping to revamp their schools' curricula in English, 3 were helping younger teachers in the school to improve their effectiveness, 1 was chairman of an articulation committee, and several of the participants who were department chairmen were working with their departments in an attempt to further the philosophy of the Institutes. Outside the school the participants were being asked to do a variety of things largely because of their Institute experience: one was to be in charge of a 10-week seminar, two others of a teachers' workshop; one was featured on an educational series on a local television station; and many had spoken or were to speak at local, district, state, and even national meetings of teachers of English. Two had already been made heads of their departments partly because they had attended Institutes, and a third expected to be appointed chairman before too long.

The last word should be a tribute to the vision and wisdom of the members of the CEEB Commission on English who planned these Institutes, financed them, and saw them through to completion. Their format was sound in principle; their staffs were dedicated and hard-working; and their participants, whatever the weaknesses of particular Institutes, were immensely benefited. What is possibly most impressive is the continuing influence of the Institutes, not only in the classrooms and school systems of the 1962 participants, but also in the universities that have imitated the CEEB Program in 1963--and doubtless now in the classrooms of their participants. Such influence deserves to spread. For although this evaluation has stressed--possibly overstressed--certain of the operational weaknesses of the CEEB Institutes, it has not criticized their basic principles or the overall organization. Taken as a whole, the Institute Program was both comprehensive and intellectually respectable. If the general competence of high-school teachers can be substantially improved within a summer session, institutes modelled on the CEEB plan seem to be the most promising means for doing it.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Since this evaluation of the 1962 Summer Institutes sponsored by the Commission on English of the College Entrance Examination Board has been undertaken primarily for the benefit of those who may wish to sponsor similar institutes in the future, these Conclusions and Implications are cast in the form of recommendations. Together with the reasons for them, most of these recommendations have been stated or strongly implied in the section just preceding. Here, therefore, they are assembled in what, it is hoped, will be a useful list. Although not every recommendation comes with the unanimous backing of the Evaluators, most of them do. And no recommendation is listed unless it has the support of a heavy majority of the Evaluators.

Aims

1. Institutes designed to upgrade the teaching of English in American high schools should have, in the order of their priority, the following general aims:
    a. To improve the academic preparation of the participants.
    b. To improve the teaching skills of the participants.
    c. To engage university and college English faculties more actively and realistically in teacher training.
2. These aims should be clearly and emphatically set forth in all publicity and in the early meetings of the institute so that every

participant realizes that the institute is not one that will devote itself exclusively or even primarily to methodology.

Staff

3. The staff should consist of a director, an instructor for each course, a workshop supervisor, and a part-time secretary. The director may or may not be one of the instructors, preferably not. If follow-up visits are planned to the high schools where the participants teach, the workshop supervisor should make as many of these visits as he can, and supervise those that are made by others.

4. The director
   a. The director should be appointed by the chairman of the Department of English after consultation with other appropriate administrative officers in the university or college.
   b. Preferably, the director should be a senior member of the Department of English.
   c. He should be given full authority over and responsibility for the operation of the institute.
   d. He need not have had high-school experience but he should have some understanding of high-school English curricula and a sympathetic awareness of the interests and needs of high-school teachers.
   e. He must be an able administrator, a person of great energy and resourcefulness, and one willing to dedicate all of his abilities for the time being to the institute.

f. He should have the major voice in the appointment of the institute staff and in the selection of the participants.

5. Course instructors

a. Instructors should be selected by the director after consultation with appropriate administrative officers.

b. At least one of the instructors should be from another institution.

c. All three instructors should be both able scholars and forceful and imaginative teachers; no appointment should be made until the director is satisfied that he has the best teachers available. It is imperative that no appointment be made purely for political reasons (e.g., to obtain the support of the Graduate Dean) or for the sake of charity (e.g., to give Professor X, who has no other assignment, a summer job).

d. At least two of the instructors should be associate or full professors.

e. At least one instructor should know high-school work intimately though it is not necessary that he be currently teaching in high school.

f. All instructors should have a clear sense of dedication to the philosophy and aims of the institute.

g. At the risk of stating the obvious, it should be said that nothing is so important to the success of an institute as the selection of able scholar-teachers who will work together well and who will be willing to accommodate their teaching to the particular sensitivities of the high-school teachers they will have as students.

6. The workshop supervisor

   a. The workshop supervisor should be selected by the director after consultation with the appropriate administrative officials.

   b. He should be given full control of the workshop and should have it as his sole responsibility in the institute.

   c. He should have had considerable experience teaching English at the high-school level, and planning high-school projects and curricula. At the same time, he should be committed to the aims of the institute, and be in full accord with the belief that the upgrading of the teaching of English in high school is not simply a matter of techniques but a matter, primarily, of improving the academic training of the teachers. In short, he must have on the one hand a love of learning and on the other an understanding of how to grapple with the day-to-day problems of the high-school teachers.

Participants

7. If the institute is to yield the greatest good for the greatest number, the group should be reasonably homogeneous, especially in formal training and in years of experience. Some of the criteria of selection employed by the CEEB Institutes are useful models which can be followed as they are, or easily modified.

   a. Participants should have at least three, but preferably five years' experience in teaching secondary-school English. [There is a need, too, for institutes for beginning teachers.]

b. Participants should look forward to 10 or more years in the classroom.

c. Participants should have college preparatory English as their principal assignment. [There is also need for institutes for teachers who do not have college preparatory students exclusively, or almost exclusively.]

d. Participants should have been majors in English at college, or should have had the equivalent of a major in course work at the undergraduate and graduate levels. [There is also a great need for institutes for those who are teaching English with an English minor or without either a major or minor in English.]

e. Participants should have the endorsement of their administrators and the assurance of their support in any attempts to upgrade the work in English along the lines suggested at the institute.

8. The screening committee should consist primarily of the director and his staff. For tactical reasons, such others as the head of the English Department, the dean of the College of Education, or a representative of the state's Department of Education may be included.

9. For purposes of screening, the committee should have each applicant submit a vita, a transcript of his academic record, letters of recommendation, and a statement by the proper administrative official promising to give the applicant a free hand to experiment in his classes.

10. In order to create a reasonably homogeneous group, the sponsors of an institute should attempt to attract two or three times the number of applicants they can accept. They can do this through effective

publicity, generous fellowships, a distinctive program, and a staff of national reputation.

11. Sponsors of an institute should especially exploit the following methods of publicity. They are listed in the order of their apparent effectiveness in attracting participants to the CEEB Institutes:
    a. Letters and brochures to English teachers in the area from which the institute is most likely to draw (usually the state in which the institute is located and the adjacent states). These should be sent out no later than February.
    b. Letters to administrative officers informing them of the institute and of the particular criteria for selection of participants. In this letter each administrative officer should be urged to send one or more of his teachers as representatives of the school or of the school system. These letters should be sent out no later than February. Wherever possible they should be followed a month later by visits.
    c. Letters to participants in previous institutes asking their help in recruiting participants for the new one.
    d. Follow-up letters to the English teachers in March or April.
    e. Publicity in newspapers in March or April accompanied by pictures of one or more of the staff members.
    f. Publicity in all local, state, and national Council publications.
    g. Announcements at meetings of local and state Councils or associations.

12. Sponsors of an institute should offer as generous fellowships as possible. If the institute is designed to attract master teachers

and department heads, the fellowship should cover tuition plus living costs. If less experienced and less influential teachers are sought, the fellowship need not be so high. If only tuition scholarships or no financial aid at all is available, the sponsors of the institute must resign themselves to the fact that they will attract a heterogeneous group and possibly not so large a group as they are prepared to accommodate.

Curriculum

13. For a rounded program within a single summer session, the model of the Commission on English seems to be altogether the best: graduate courses in literature, language, and composition together with a workshop in which the participants have a chance to translate their new ideas and materials into practical projects for their own classrooms. While there is a place for the more specialized institute--one, for instance, in linguistics alone--the Commission format is strongly recommended for those who wish to upgrade the teaching of English in all of its major aspects.

14. The Literature course

    a. This course should be designed to make the participant more aware of the various important approaches to the literary work (*e.g.*, the analytical, the biographical, the socio-cultural, the ideological, the generic, the comparative, the mythical, the ethical). The advantages and disadvantages of a number of these approaches should be discussed and demonstrated. But the emphasis in the course should be on formal analysis since this is the approach that is most pertinent for the participant, both as reader and as teacher.

b. The several genres should be examined beginning with fiction (the most familiar for most participants) and moving to poetry and the drama.

c. The works read should be only of the best, and should be selected without any regard to whether or not they are used in high-school classes.

d. The papers assigned should provide practice for the participants in the use of at least two or three of the approaches discussed in class.

e. This should be a rigorous course, clearly operating at the graduate level. Textbooks and anthologies commonly employed in undergraduate "Introduction to Literature" courses should be avoided. Instead, in addition to the primary works assigned, the participants should be required to read and discuss representative critical essays of our time.

f. The participants should be introduced through this course to those bibliographical aids that will be most useful to them as readers and teachers of literature.

15. The Language course

a. As in the CEEB Institutes, the language course should be designed (1) to make the participant more aware of language as a field of study, (2) to show him the basic assumptions and methods of linguistics, and (3) to encourage him to undertake further study of linguistics and offer guidelines for that study.

b. The course might appropriately consider both the historical development of English and its present nature. Pertinent aspects of phonology, morphology, syntax, and semantics should be dealt with as the need arises in such a consideration.

c. Although one grammar should be stressed, the advantages and disadvantages of several should be pointed out and discussed (e.g., the traditional, the structural, the transformational).

d. Great caution should be exercised in teaching this course. It should be remembered that many of the teachers may cherish the traditional concepts and resent any unsupported attack upon them. It should be further remembered that most of the participants will be relatively unsophisticated in the field. The instructor should introduce new terminology slowly, should keep his presentations as orderly and simple as possible, should avoid trying to cram too much into the course, and should avoid becoming simply a crusader for a particular point of view. Unless the participants have been selected because of their sophistication in linguistics, the course should be viewed as an introduction to the field, not as a seminar for specialists.

e. Although readings may be required in various sources, one textbook should be made basic in order that the course may achieve an appreciable degree of unity as well as coherence.

f. Assignments should be challenging but not so difficult for the participants that they become discouraged and resentful. Each assignment should be followed by a discussion in class for the purpose of clearing up confusion.

16. The Composition course

a. The aim of the composition course, as in the CEEB Institutes, should be to help the participant become a better writer himself and a better critic of the writing of others. The course should stress both the producer and the product. That is, it should concern itself with the purposes of the writer and the rhetorical strategy he employs to achieve his purposes. It should also concern itself with such elements of the written work as the selection and deployment of material, the form of paragraphs and sentences, the diction, and the mechanics of the written composition.

b. The writing of the participants should be examined for its effectiveness as communication and for its appeal as art, and the interrelations of these two should be explored.

c. The standards of this course must be a matter of constant concern. No textbook commonly employed in undergraduate courses should be used. Instead, the readings should be the finest in the fields of rhetoric and stylistics. The works assigned might be so diverse as The Road to Xanadu (to show the value of genetic criticism for writing) and the Phaedrus (to show the value of a powerful rhetorical demonstration).

d. Class meetings should be reduced sufficiently to make individual conferences possible; as many as 50 participants can be handled adequately in a single class so long as there are at least three conferences with each participant during the course of the term.

e. Writing assignments should be varied in order to give the participants practice in handling different voices and tones, varying materials and organizations.

f. Frequent short papers should be assigned rather than a few long ones.

g. Writing assignments should occasionally be combined with assignments in literature and language.

h. Especial care must be taken in correcting the papers written for this course. The instructor should use the method he would recommend for the participants in the grading of their papers. What is more, he should comment on the papers with due regard for the fact that they have been written by persons who are themselves teachers and who, therefore, may be unduly sensitive to criticism.

17. The Workshop

a. The workshop should be, first of all, a forum where the group as a whole can evaluate what they have been learning, where they can think up interrelations among the disciplines and see their possibilities for high-school teaching, where they can share the ideas and dreams that they have not had an opportunity to share during the courses. Secondly, the workshop should have the more practical objective of giving participants practice in adapting the material and techniques and philosophy of the courses to their own high-school teaching. In such practice the emphasis should be on such matters as the articulation of parts in a cumulative and sequential curriculum, standards that will assure intellectual respectability, material consonant with the desired standards, and the approaches best calculated to be effective with the particular material and the particular students.

b. The workshop should follow the courses, not operate concurrently with them. In a 6-week institute, the courses might profitably run for 5 and the workshop for 1; in an 8-week institute, the distribution might be 6 and 2. The objectives of the workshop should be explained during the weeks of the courses; plans may then be laid, and even some material provided. But the participant should not be asked to commit himself to a major project until the courses have come to an end.

c. By its nature, a workshop is more informal than a class. But its objectives must be just as clear and its direction just as sure. From the beginning of the workshop, each participant should have a schedule showing its basic pattern: the general meetings, the group meetings, the individual conferences. Time should be left for spontaneous activity, but a basic schedule is imperative.

d. Such as it is, the evidence indicates that the most promising and imaginative workshop projects come from the participants working together in small groups of about five.

e. The workshop must operate at the same high intellectual level of the courses. Discussion must be probing; lesson plans and projects must display both imagination and insight. To maintain high standards is the difficult task of the supervisor. He must constantly guard against the desire of many participants to work over the hackneyed or to build lesson plans on gimmicks.

18. Integration of the three disciplines. Unless the staff wishes to make one of the disciplines, say literature, pre-eminent and place the others in supporting roles, no real integration of the three seems feasible. Yet it will be enormously helpful to the participants to

point out in the courses and especially in the workshops the major interrelations among them. Written assignments should be used to help the students realize for themselves some of the interrelations.

Diagnostic Tests

19. Before requiring the participants to take diagnostic tests, an institute staff should be sure (a) that they know precisely what they want to diagnose, (b) that the tests are valid and adequate instruments for such diagnoses, and (c) that they (the staff) are willing to restudy their syllabi in the light of the test results and make such revisions as seem indicated. Unless all of these conditions obtain, an initial testing program is a needless luxury.

20. Since diagnostic tests may shatter the confidence of many of the participants, their purpose should be explained before they are administered and the results discussed afterward.

Physical Characteristics and Arrangements

21. Size. Any enrollment between 20 and 45 seems large enough to justify the venture and small enough to be manageable.

22. Class schedule. Possibly the most successful CEEB schedule called for classes at 8:00 and 9:00 a.m., a coffee break at 10:00 a.m., and the third class at 11:00 a.m. During its week or 2 weeks, the workshop might appropriately meet for an hour at 8:00 or 9:00 a.m. and then break up for individual or small group projects.

23. Work load. Assignments in the three courses should be carefully articulated so that they are well balanced, well spaced, and not out of line in any course with assignments normally made in a 2-hour course at the graduate level.

24. Graduate credit. Graduate credit should be awarded at the rate of one semester hour for each week of the institute, assuming approximately 15 hours of class work per week.

25. Extra-curricular activities. At the very least, there should be an opening reception, possibly the day before the first meeting of the classes. Regular midmorning coffee breaks are essential. If possible, social events should be scheduled for the mid-term and the end of the term. Lectures or special discussions can profitably be held in the evening, though these should never occur more often than once a week. Otherwise, the participants should be left to their own social devices. Too heavy a social schedule can be just as harmful as too light a one.

26. Library facilities. Books the participants are likely to need frequently should be checked out of the library and placed in the institute room.

27. Classrooms. One room should be reserved for the institute. Not only should the classes and the workshop meet in this room, but it should be available at other hours during the day for individual study or group discussions. It cannot be emphasized too strongly that an institute should have its own room.

28. Housing and dining. To facilitate informal discussions, the women in the institute should be housed on the same floor in the women's dormitory and the men on the same floor in the men's dormitory. The

participants should be left to make their own dining arrangements, though an occasional lunch together can be a helpful enterprise.

29. Commuting. Commuting should be discouraged but need not be prohibited. The commuter loses what can be gained from informal discussions with other participants, but there is no evidence to indicate that he does less well in the courses or workshop.

30. Sites. Teachers and administrators in urban areas like Philadelphia and Chicago, and in Midwestern states like Iowa and Kansas were considerably distressed that there were no CEEB Institutes where teachers in their areas could go. Universities and colleges in the areas neglected by the Commission on English should be particularly eager to establish institutes in the near future.

Follow-up Activities

31. Follow-up visits to the participants' high-school classes can be most useful. They demonstrate the continuing interest of the college or the university, and they provide an opportunity for further guidance. Normally these visits should be made by the workshop supervisor, who should have his teaching schedule lightened for this purpose. The visits should be scheduled for the second semester of the school year.

32. Also to demonstrate the continuing interest of the college or university, a meeting of the participants should be scheduled for some Saturday during the winter. Participants as well as staff members and a guest speaker should appear on the program.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

Checklist for Visitors to CEEB Summer Institutes

Explanation of Symbols

*	A half-sheet is provided for your comments.
(D)	This item is on the questionnaire for directors.
(DP)	This item is on the questionnaire for directors but probe for detailed information.
(P)	This item is on the questionnaire for participants.
(PP)	This item is on the questionnaire for participants but probe for detailed information.

---

1. **General Aims**

*1.1 The first general aim, as announced, is to improve the academic preparation and the teaching skills of the participants.
  a. How well do you think this aim is being achieved?
  b. Do the participants seem to know this is a general aim? If so, do they generally accept and approve of it?

*1.2 The second general aim, as announced, is to amass samples of excellent teaching materials appropriate for college preparatory classes.
  a. How well do you think this aim is being achieved?
  b. Do participants seem to know this is a general aim? If so, do they accept and approve of it?

*1.3 The third general aim, as announced, is to engage university faculties more actively and realistically in teacher training. Do you find any evidence indicating that this aim is being achieved?

*1.4 The fourth general aim, as announced, is to prove the feasibility of similar institutes.
  a. Do you think this Institute demonstrates the feasibility of such institutes in general?
  b. Do the participants feel that there should be more such institutes?

*1.5 Recommendations on General Aims for directors of future institute

2. **Size of Institutes**

2.1 What was original enrollment? (D)

2.2 How many drop-outs have there been and what have been the reasons for the drop-outs? (D)

*2.3 What is the Director's opinion about the size of the Institute? (DP)
*2.4 What do the participants think about the size of the Institute? (PP)
*2.5 What is your opinion about the size of the Institute? (Is it too large for what it is trying to do? too small? Does the size allow for adequate follow-up? What is the optimum ratio of faculty to students? etc.)
*2.6 Other
*2.7 Recommendations on Size for directors of future institutes

3. Schedule

3.1 Length of the term
  a. What is the length? (D)
  b. How much time does testing take? (D)
  *c. What is Director's opinion about the length of the term? (DP)
  *d. What do the participants think about the length of the term? (PP)
3.2 What graduate credit is granted? (D)
3.3 Work load
  a. How many hours a week do the participants spend on Institute work? (P)
  b. Are any of them enrolled for regular summer school courses? (P)
3.4 Extra-curricular activities
  a. What extra-curricular activities have been planned? (D)
  *b. What does the Director think of the extra-curricular activities? (DP)
  *c. What do the participants think of the extra-curricular activities? Are they the kind they want? Are there about the right number? etc. (DP)
3.5 Free time
  a. About how much free time does a participant have each week? (P)
  *b. Do the participants think they have about the right amount of free time? Do they think the non-class hours have been too rigorously programmed? (PP)
*3.6 What is your opinion of the schedule (length of term, hours in class, hours in workshop, extra-curricular activities, free time, etc.)?
*3.7 Other
*3.8 Recommendations on Schedule for directors of future institutes

4. Administration

*4.1 Relation of the Institute to the Department of English
  a. Describe the organizational pattern.
  b. How much support does the Institute seem to be getting from the departmental chairman?

c. Do you think the Institute is enthusiastically supported by the Department as a whole? tolerated? opposed? Has the attitude changed since the Institute opened?

4.2 Director

a. What are his regular rank and special field? (D)

b. How was he selected? (D)

c. Is he giving full time to the Institute? If not, what percentage of his time? (D)

*d. Does the Director feel that directing the Institute should be a full-time job? Does he feel that he can (could) direct and teach a course? (DP)

e. What experience has the Director had with the teaching of English at the secondary-school level?

*f. Does Director think experience at secondary level necessary for his job? Is it crucial for the follow-up? (DP)

g. Did Director appoint staff? If not, who did? (D)

h. How much secretarial help is desirable? (D)

*i. Does Director seem to have authority consonant with responsibility?

4.3 Efficiency of administration

*a. Do staff members seem sure of rules and procedures of Institute?

*b. Do participants seem sure of rules and procedures of Institute? How are they informed of them?

*c. What is your opinion of the administration as a whole? Is it smooth? uncertain? bungled? (Note especially the administration of the Workshop.)

*4.4 Other

*4.5 Recommendations on Administration for directors of future institutes

5. Staff

5.1 Staff meetings

*a. How much briefing of staff occurred before the Institute opened? Was this ample? (DP)

b. How often does the staff get together for discussion of Institute affairs? (D)

5.2 Literature instructor

a. What are the name and title of the literature instructor? (D)

b. What are the regular teaching assignments of the literature instructor? (D)

*c. Has the literature instructor ever taught literature in high school? Is such teaching necessary or desirable for effective teaching in the Institute? (DP)

*d. What techniques of the literature instructor strike you as being especially good? rather poor?

*e. Rate the literature instructor by such criteria as (1) knowledge of his subject, (2) skill in presenting subject, (3) interest and enthusiasm in subject, (4) tolerance and emotional balance, (5) helpfulness to students, (6) sense of humor, and (7) freedom from annoying mannerisms.

5.3 Language instructor
   - a. What are the name and title of the language instructor? (D)
   - b. What are the regular teaching assignments of the language instructor? (D)
   - *c. Has the language instructor ever taught language in high school? Is such teaching necessary or desirable for effective teaching in the Institute? (DP)
   - *d. What techniques of the language instructor strike you as being especially good? rather poor?
   - *e. Rate by such usual criteria as (1) knowledge of his subject, (2) skill in presenting subject, (3) interest and enthusiasm in subject, (4) tolerance and emotional balance, (5) helpfulness to students, (6) sense of humor, and (7) freedom from annoying mannerisms.

5.4 Composition instructor
   - a. What are the name and title of the composition instructor? (D)
   - b. What are the regular teaching assignments of the composition instructor? (D)
   - *c. Has the composition instructor ever taught composition in high school? Is such teaching necessary or desirable for effective teaching in the Institute? (DP)
   - *d. Does the composition instructor do a fair amount of writing? What kinds of writing? (DP)
   - *e. What techniques of the composition instructor strike you as being especially good? rather poor?
   - *f. Rate composition instructor by such usual criteria as (1) knowledge of his subject, (2) skill in presenting subject, (3) interest and enthusiasm in subject, (4) tolerance and emotional balance, (5) helpfulness to students, (6) sense of humor, and (7) freedom from annoying mannerisms. Is he on the defensive?

5,5 What is Director's opinion of the staff? (DP)

*5.6 What is the attitude of the staff toward you?

*5.7 General evaluation of staff (Do the staff members seem to cooperate with one another? Do they make themselves available to students? Are they as effective in the Workshop as in their lectures? etc.)

*5.8 Recommendations on Staff for directors of future institutes

6. Participants

6.1 Selection procedures
   - a. What were the means of selecting participants? (D)
   - b. How many invitations to participate in the Institute were turned down and what reasons were given? (D)
   - c. Was preference given to graduates of this university? (D)
   - d. Was the type of participants obtained the same as desired? (D)
   - *e. Would you change selection procedures another time? (DP)

6.2 Announced criteria for selection
   - a. Have they had at least three years' experience in teaching secondary-school English? (P)
   - b. Do they look forward to ten or more years in the classroom? (P)

- c. Are their principle assignments in college preparatory English? (P)
- d. Do they have an undergraduate major in English or the equivalent in subject matter courses? (P)
- e. Are they taking additional courses this summer? (P)
- f. Do their schools regularly send a substantial portion of their graduates to college? (P)
- g. Do they have their administration's assurance of support for experimentation in their classrooms? (P)

6.3 Distribution of participants: age, sex, level of preparation, teaching experience, size of high school (P)

6.4 Miscellaneous information about participants

- a. What are their regular teaching assignments? (P)
- b. How did they find out about the Institute? (P)
- c. What was their main reason for enrolling? (P)
- d. Have they attended other institutes or workshops? (P)
- e. Are they affiliated with state and national organizations? (P)

*6.5 What is the reaction of the participants to the Workshop? (Do they feel their teaching will improve? Are they eager to upgrade their work? Do they plan to take further graduate work? Would they like to attend another institute next year? etc.)

*6.6 General evaluation of participants

*6.7 Other

*6.8 Recommendations on Participants for directors of future institutes

7. Literature

7.1 Basic aims

- *a. Is there a strong presentation of literature as an illuminating experience?
- *b. Is the work specifically directed at the stated aim to increase the teacher's knowledge of what is involved in the close reading of a literary work? Do the students seem to recognize this as an aim? Do they approve of it?

7.2 Organization and scope

- *a. Does the Institute follow the printed plan? If not, how does it deviate? What are the strengths of the organization? the weaknesses? Should the instructor be allowed more flexibility?
- *b. Is the scope of work in literature indicated by the printed plan? If not, how does it deviate?
- *c. What are the participants' attitudes toward the organization and scope of the literature course? (DP)
- *d. What do you think of the scope of the literature course?

7.3 Material

- *a. Remembering that these are high-school teachers, is level of material in lectures appropriate? is level of reading?
- *b. Is work in literature directed at the participants' education? Do the participants realize and approve this intent or are they looking for material to use in their high-school classes? Do they plan to teach courses discussed in Institute?

7.4 Critical emphases
- *a. Recognizing the built-in emphasis of the literature course, do you think more attention should be given to approaches other than that of close analysis?
- *b. What aspects of the literary work are getting most attention? Be as specific as you can. Add your opinion.

7.5 Theory and application of theory
- *a. Is time spent in the classroom discussing application of theory to high-school teaching?
- *b. What means are employed to transfer theory of lectures to practical work of Workshop?
- *c. How closely does the Workshop activity reflect the theory in the lectures? What items show up most prominently?

7.6 Amount of work required
- a. How many hours a week does participant spend on literature course? (P)
- *b. Does literature take priority if student is cramped for time? (PP)
- *c. What kinds of papers are required? other assignments? your opinion of these?

*7.7 Other

7.8 General evaluation and predictions
- *a. What is your general evaluation of the literature program? Is it worth graduate credit? etc.
- *b. What would you predict would be the most valuable aspects of this literature program for the participants in their high-school classes? What did they seem to like best? least?
- *c. Recommendations on literature course for directors of future institutes

8. Language

8.1 Basic aims
- *a. Is the work in language directed specifically at the aims announced in the brochure: (1) to make the teacher aware of language as a field of study, (2) to show him the basic assumptions and methods of linguistics, and (3) to encourage him to undertake further study of linguistics and offer guidelines for that study. Do the students seem to recognize these aims and approve of them?
- *b. Do you feel that the desired outcomes are ones that can be reasonably expected?

8.2 Organization and scope
- *a. Does the work in language follow the printed plan? If not, how does it deviate? What are strengths of organization? weaknesses?
- *b. How does the actual coverage correspond to the proposed coverage? If it does not correspond, how does it deviate?
- *c. What are the participants' attitudes toward the organization and scope of the language course? (DP)

8.3 Material
- *a. Remembering that these are high-school teachers, is the level of material in the lectures appropriate? is the level of reading?
- *b. Is the work in language directed at the participants' education? Do the participants share the spirit of this intent or are they looking for material to use in their high-school classrooms?

8.4 Emphases
- *a. Are three current grammars of English really surveyed? Comment on this in detail.
- *b. Which grammar is most strongly stressed and which aspects of it?

8.5 Theory and application of theory
- *a. Is time spent in the classroom discussing application of theory to high-school teaching? If so, tell how.
- *b. What means are employed to transfer theory in lectures to practical work in Workshop?
- *c. How closely does the Workshop activity reflect the theory of the lectures? Do you find the participants in the Workshop clinging to the "rules"? What items from the lectures show up most prominently in the Workshop?

8.6 Amount of work required
- a. How many hours a week does a participant spend on the language course? (P)
- *b. Does language take priority if a student is cramped for time? (PP)
- *c. What kinds of assignments are required? your opinion of these?

*8.7 Other

8.8 General evaluation and predictions
- *a. What is your general evaluation of the language program? (Is it worth college credit? Keep in mind also such things as the instructor's attempt to take participants' backgrounds and prejudices in mind; the variety of the approach; the intellectual development of the teachers; the adaptability of the theory to work with adolescents; etc.)
- *b. What would you predict would be the most valuable aspects of the language program for the participants in their high-school classes?
- *c. Recommendations on a language course for directors of future institutes

9. Composition

9.1 Basic aims
- *a. Which course in composition is given? Is the work specifically directed at the aims stated in the brown brochure? Do the students seem to recognize these aims and approve of them?
- *b. Is there a clear attempt to make composition and the teaching of composition academically and intellectually respectable?

9.2 Organization and scope

*a. Does the work in composition follow the printed plan? If not, how does it deviate? What are the strengths of the organization? the weaknesses?

*b. Is the scope of the work in composition indicated by the printed plan? If not, how does it deviate? Do you think too much is attempted? too little?

*c. What are the participants' attitudes toward the organization and scope of the composition course? (DP)

9.3 Material

*a. Describe the material used in the lectures. Will it serve the purpose of evoking good writing?

*b. Is the work in composition directed at the participants' education? Do the participants realize and approve this intent or are they looking for material to use in their high-school classes?

9.4 Emphases

*a. What aspects of writing are especially emphasized? Are some aspects emphasized unduly? Are others neglected?

*b. Are various kinds of writing discussed? Which are discussed most frequently? Are some badly neglected?

9.5 Techniques for grading student papers: what are they and what is your opinion of them?

9.6 Theory and application of theory

*a. Is time spent in the classroom discussing application of theory to high-school teaching?

*b. What means are employed to transfer theory of lectures to practical work of Workshop?

*c. How closely does the Workshop activity reflect the theory in the lectures? What items show up most prominently?

9.7 Amount of work required

a. How many hours a week does the participant spend on composition course? (P)

*b. Does composition take priority if student is cramped for time? (PP)

*c. How many and what kinds of papers are required? your opinion of these?

*9.8 Other

9.9 General evaluation and predictions

*a. What is your general evaluation of the composition program? Has the teacher managed to make the course a humane educational experience? Does the work deserve graduate credit?

*b. What would you predict would be the most valuable aspects of the composition program for the participants in their high-school classes?

*c. Recommendations on a composition course for directors of future institutes

10. Integration of courses

*10.1 Lectures: to what extent do the lecturers establish connections among the three legs of the English "tripod"? In short, do you get a sense of a unified Institute from the lectures?

10.2 Workshops
    a. Schedule of Workshops (D)
    *b. How is the Workshop activity organized?
    *c. What specific methods are used in the Workshop to integrate the subject matter of the three courses? Do you feel that the integration is basic or token?
*10.3 Other
10.4 General evaluation and predictions
    *a. How successful do you think the Institute as a whole has been in integrating the material of the three disciplines?
    *b. What aspects of integration do you think are most likely to be helpful to the participant once he is back in his high-school classroom?
    *c. Recommendations on integration for directors of future institutes

11. Tests

*11.1 Diagnostic tests: what is your opinion of their difficulty, reliability, validity? Did these tests shock the participants unduly?
*11.2 What is your opinion of the final tests: level of difficulty, reliability, validity?

12. Physical arrangements

*12.1 Office facilities for director and instructors: describe and evaluate.
*12.2 Dormitory arrangements: describe and comment on. Note especially whether participants are being housed with other summer school students.
*12.3 Dining arrangements: describe and comment on. Note especially whether participants are dining with other summer school students.
*12.4 Classrooms: give number and comment on. Note especially whether Institute rooms are isolated.
*12.5 Workshop: describe. Note especially whether or not a student can work in it quietly by himself. Also note how frequently it is used.
*12.6 Equipment: indicate audio-visual devices, mimeograph machine, and other equipment used, and comment on.
*12.7 Library facilities: Indicate especially the availability of books and of periodicals needed by the Workshop participants.
*12.8 Distances between centers of Workshop activity
*12.9 Housing facilities for those with dependents: indicate where participants with dependents must live and how far these accommodations are from classrooms. Also indicate whether you think it is a good idea for participants to bring dependents to such an Institute.
*12.10 Other
*12.11 General evaluation of physical arrangements
*12.12 Recommendations on physical arrangements for directors of future institutes

APPENDIX B

CEEB 1962 Summer Institutes

Participants' Questionnaire

To the Institute Participant:

These questionnaires have been compiled by a group making a study of the CEEB Institutes at the request of the Office of Education. The primary purpose of the study is to provide information and recommendations for those who may sponsor similar institutes in the future. Your judgments, therefore, can be very helpful. You need not sign your name.

I hope that you can find time to fill in the blanks as thoughtfully as possible. Use the backs of these sheets if you need more space. All those connected with the study will be most grateful to you for any help that you give.

John C. Gerber
University of Iowa

---

1. Your age____ Sex____ Married or single___ No. of children___
2. Place and date of your B.A. degree________________
3. Major as an undergraduate__________ Minor, if any________
4. Approximate number of undergraduate credits in English you have earned____
5. Approximate number of graduate credits in English you have earned___
6. Place and date of M.A. degree if you have one____________
7. Approximate size of the high school in which you now teach________
8. Total number of years you have taught English in high school______
9. Do you plan to teach English for at least ten more years?________
10. What are your regular teaching assignments?________________
____
11. How many of your teaching assignments can properly be called "college preparatory English"? Encircle one: ALL MOST HALF FEW NONE
12. Are you taking additional courses this summer?____ If yes, what are they?____
13. Roughly what proportion of the graduates of your high school go to college?____
14. Do you have your administrator's assurance of support for experimentation in your classroom this coming school year?____ If the support is qualified, what are the qualifications?________________
____
15. With what local, state, or national professional organizations are you affiliated?____
____
16. What other institutes or workshops have you ever attended?________
____
17. How did you hear about this Institute?________________________

18. What were your main reasons for enrolling?____________________

19. Please give your impressions of the course in Literature:
   a. The approximate number of hours you devote to it each week (including classes, workshop, and preparation)__________
   b. The objectives of the course   Encircle one:
      FULLY ACCEPTABLE   ACCEPTABLE   ACCEPTABLE IN PART
      UNACCEPTABLE   DON'T KNOW THEM
   c. The organization of the course   Encircle one:
      EXCELLENT   GOOD   FAIR   MEDIOCRE   POOR
   d. The level of difficulty for you   Encircle one:
      MUCH TOO HARD   TOO HARD   ABOUT RIGHT   TOO EASY
      MUCH TOO EASY
   e. The teaching of the course   Encircle one:
      BRILLIANT   EXCELLENT   GOOD   ADEQUATE   POOR   VERY POOR
   f. Its value for your own education   Encircle one:
      EXTREMELY VALUABLE   VALUABLE   SOME VALUE   LITTLE VALUE
      WORTHLESS
   g. Its practical value for your high-school teaching   Encircle one:
      EXTREMELY HELPFUL   VERY HELPFUL   SOME HELP   LITTLE HELP
      WORTHLESS
   h. If you were advising someone planning to sponsor a similar institute next year, what suggestions would you have about the course in literature? Should it be exactly the same? Should it be modified in any way?____________________

20. Please give your impressions of the course in Language:
   a. The approximate number of hours you devote to it each week (including classes, workshop, and preparation)__________
   b. The objectives of the course   Encircle one:
      FULLY ACCEPTABLE   ACCEPTABLE   ACCEPTABLE IN PART
      UNACCEPTABLE   DON'T KNOW THEM
   c. The organization of the course   Encircle one:
      EXCELLENT   GOOD   FAIR   MEDIOCRE   POOR
   d. The level of difficulty for you   Encircle one:
      MUCH TOO HARD   TOO HARD   ABOUT RIGHT   TOO EASY
      MUCH TOO EASY
   e. The teaching of the course   Encircle one:
      BRILLIANT   EXCELLENT   GOOD   ADEQUATE   POOR   VERY POOR
   f. Its value for your own education   Encircle one:
      EXTREMELY VALUABLE   VALUABLE   SOME VALUE   LITTLE VALUE
      WORTHLESS
   g. Its practical value for your high-school teaching   Encircle one:
      EXTREMELY HELPFUL   VERY HELPFUL   SOME HELP   LITTLE HELP
      WORTHLESS
   h. If you were advising someone planning to sponsor a similar institute next year, what suggestions would you have about the course in language? Should it be exactly the same? Should it be modified in any way?____________________

21. Please give your impressions of the course in Composition:
    a. The approximate number of hours you devote to it each week (including classes, workshop, and preparation)________________
    b. The objectives of the course Encircle one:
    FULLY ACCEPTABLE ACCEPTABLE ACCEPTABLE IN PART
    UNACCEPTABLE DON'T KNOW THEM
    c. The organization of the course Encircle one:
    EXCELLENT GOOD FAIR MEDIOCRE POOR
    d. The level of difficulty for you Encircle one:
    MUCH TOO HARD TOO HARD ABOUT RIGHT TOO EASY
    MUCH TOO EASY
    e. The teaching of the course Encircle one:
    BRILLIANT EXCELLENT GOOD ADEQUATE POOR VERY POOR
    f. Its value for your own education Encircle one:
    EXTREMELY VALUABLE VALUABLE SOME VALUE LITTLE VALUE
    WORTHLESS
    g. Its practical value for your high-school teaching Encircle one:
    EXTREMELY HELPFUL VERY HELPFUL SOME HELP LITTLE HELP
    WORTHLESS
    h. If you were advising someone planning to sponsor a similar institute next year, what suggestions would you have about the course in composition? Should it be exactly the same? Should it be modified in any way?________________________________
    ____
    ____

22. Please give an estimate of the value of the Workshop to you and make any suggestions about it that would be helpful to someone sponsoring a similar institute next year.__________________________
    ____
    ____

23. What is your feeling about the total work load (classes, workshop, preparation)?
    MUCH TOO HEAVY TOO HEAVY ABOUT RIGHT TOO LIGHT
    MUCH TOO LIGHT

24. When you get pressed for time, to which of the three subjects do you give priority? Encircle one: LITERATURE LANGUAGE COMPOSITION

25. Everything considered, which of the three subjects is proving most exciting and profitable to you? Encircle one:
    LITERATURE LANGUAGE COMPOSITION

26. Has the Institute been helpful in showing you how work in literature, language, and composition can be integrated? Encircle one:
    EXTREMELY HELPFUL VERY HELPFUL HELPFUL SLIGHTLY HELPFUL
    NOT AT ALL HELPFUL

27. Do you have any suggestions for directors of future institutes about the ways in which the Institute can be of help to high-school teachers in showing them the possibilities for integrating work in literature, language, and composition?__________________________
    ____
    ____
    ____
    ____
    ____

28. As you think about the curriculum of the Institute, do you feel that it has been wise to cover Literature, Language, and Composition in one institute? YES NO If you answer NO, please indicate what you would have preferred to have the Institute deal with. Encircle one:

Literature alone	Literature and Language
Language alone	Literature and Composition
Composition alone	Language and Composition

29. What are your reactions to the physical arrangements (housing, dining, classrooms, etc.)? Encircle one:
EXCELLENT GOOD FAIR MEDIOCRE POOR

30. What suggestions about physical arrangements would you make to someone preparing to sponsor a similar institute next year?__________

If you have any general comments that would be useful to directors of similar institutes, please add them here and on the back of this sheet.

APPENDIX C

CEEB 1962 Summer Institute

Directors' Questionnaire

To the Director:

This questionnaire has been worked out by those visiting the CEEB institutes under the auspices of the Office of Education. Its primary purpose is to provide information that will be helpful to those sponsoring similar institutes in future years. We hope that you will be able to find time to fill this out and to make your answers as specific as possible. Needless to say, all information will be considered confidential. None of it will be identified without your permission.

We are most grateful for your help.

John C. Gerber
University of Iowa

Term

1. What is the length of the term of the Institute?__________weeks
2. How many days are used for testing?____________________days
3. If you were directing an institute another year, would you change the length of the term? If so, how and why?________________

   ____

   ____

   ____

Graduate Credit

4. How much graduate credit is awarded?____________________
5. If you were directing an institute another year, would you change the amount of graduate credit? If so, how much would you award and why would you make the change?____________________

   ____

   ____

   ____

   ____

Selection Procedures

6. How were participants selected?________________________

7. How many invitations to participate in your Institute were turned down and what reasons were given?________________________

8. Was preference given to graduates of your university?________

9. On the whole did you get the type of participant you wanted?___

10. If you were directing an institute another year, would you change the selection procedures? If so, how and why?________

Enrollment

11. What was the original enrollment?________________________

12. How many drop-outs have there been and what have been the main reasons for the drop-outs?________________________

13. If you were directing an institute another year, would you change the size of the institute? If so, what would you want the total enrollment to be and why?________________________

Extra-curricular Activities

14. What extra-curricular activities were formally planned for the participants in the Institute?________________________

____

15. What activities have proved most successful in your opinion?___

____

____

____

16. If you were directing an institute another year, would you change the program of extra-curricular activities? If so, how and why?

____

____

____

Schedule

17. Please give the daily schedule for courses and Workshop. ____

____

____

____

____

18. If you were directing an institute another year, would you change this schedule? If so, how and why?________________

____

____

____

Director of Institute

19. What is your regular rank?________________
20. What is your special field of scholarship?____________
21. What are your regular teaching assignments?___________

____

22. Who selected you to be director of the Institute?_________

____

23. Are you giving full-time this summer to the Institute?______

24. Are you teaching a course in the Institute as well as being Director? If so, which one?______
25. Do you think it desirable for the director to teach a course or is it better for the director to devote full-time to the duties of director? Please elaborate on your answer briefly.

26. Have you had any experience teaching English at the secondary level? If so, where and when?______

27. Do you think it is necessary or desirable for an institute director to have had high-school teaching experience? Please elaborate on this answer.______

28. Did you appoint your course instructors?______
If not, who did?______
29. Roughly how many staff meetings did you have before the Institute opened?____ How often do you and the staff meet during the weeks of the Institute?______
30. What recommendations about staff discussions would you make to directors of future institutes?______

31. How much secretarial help is necessary to run the Institute efficiently?______
32. How large a general expense budget is necessary?______
33. What office equipment (other than obvious items like a typewriter) is desirable for the operation of the Institute?______

Instructor for the Work in Literature

34. Who is in charge of the work in literature?______
35. What is his rank?______
36. What is his special field of scholarship?______
37. What are his regular teaching assignments?______

38. Has he ever taught literature in high school?_______________
39. Do you think such teaching necessary or desirable for teaching literature in the Institute literature course or in the Workshop? Please elaborate.____

Instructor for the Work in Language

40. Who is in charge of the work in language?_______________
41. What is his rank?____________________________________
42. What is his special field of scholarship?_______________
43. What are his regular teaching assignments?_______________
44. Has he ever taught language in high school?_______________
45. Do you think such teaching necessary or desirable for teaching language in the Institute language course or in the Workshop? Please elaborate.____

Instructor for the Work in Composition

46. Who is in charge of the work in composition?_______________
47. What is his rank?____________________________________
48. What is his special field of scholarship?_______________
49. What are his regular teaching assignments?_______________
50. Has he ever taught composition in high school?_______________
51. Do you think such teaching necessary or desirable for teaching composition in the Institute composition course or in the Workshop? Please elaborate.____

Curriculum

52. If you were directing an institute another year, would you include training in all three of the areas covered this year (literature, language, composition)? If not, what changes

would you make and why?____________________

53. If you were directing an institute another year, would you make any major changes in the work in literature? If so, what and why?____________________

54. If you were directing an institute another year, would you make any major changes in the work in language? If so, what and why?____________________

55. If you were directing an institute another year, would you make any major changes in the work in composition? If so, what and why?____________________

56. Please describe briefly the organization of Workshop activity.

57. If you were directing an institute another year, would you make any changes in the operation of the Workshop? If so, what and why?____________________

58. Do you approve of the uniform syllabi for all institutes or would you have preferred more flexible syllabi or even your own syllabi? Please elaborate on your answer.____________________

University Relations

59. How would you describe the attitude of the Department of English toward your Institute?

60. How would you describe the attitude of the College of Education toward your Institute?

61. How would you describe the attitude of the university administration toward the Institute?

62. Do you have any special advice to give to future directors about the relations of their institutes with their Departments, their College of Education, their administration?

Physical Arrangements

63. On the whole have you been satisfied with the physical arrangements for your Institute?

64. What major suggestions about physical arrangements do you have for those who may be directing institutes in the future?

Tests

65. What use have you made of the initial tests?________________

____

____

____

66. What is your personal opinion of the testing program?________

____

____

____

General

67. Would you say the Institute is fulfilling its objectives about as you expected? better than you expected? less well than you expected? Please elaborate briefly.__________________

____

____

____

68. Do you have any general recommendations for those planning future institutes?____________________________

____

____

____

____

____

Date____________________ Signed____________________
Director

Institute____________________

APPENDIX D

Schedule of Visits to Institutes

Institute	Dates of Visits	Evaluators
Cornell	July 2-6	Gwynn
June 27-August 10	July 30-August 3	Ives
Duke	June 25-29	Ives
June 12-July 17	July 9-13	Jordan
Harvard	July 23-27	Gerber
July 2-August 24	August 13-17	Wilson
Indiana	June 25-29	Albrecht
June 15-August 10	July 30-August 3	Tuttle
New York University	July 9-13	Tuttle
July 2-August 10	July 30-August 3	Gerber
Ohio State	June 25-29	Burton
June 18-July 27	July 23-27	Tuttle
Penn State	July 16-20	Wilson
July 9-August 17	August 6-10	Dickinson
	August 9	Gerber
Rutgers	July 16-20	Tuttle
July 1-August 10	July 30-August 3	Wilson
St. Louis	June 25-29	Dickinson
June 15-July 28	July 23-27	Slaughter
Southern Illinois	June 25-29	Tuttle
June 18-August 9	July 30-August 3	Slaughter
Stanford	July 2-6	McGalliard
June 25-August 18	August 6-10	Jordan
State University of		
New York at Albany	July 16-20	Gwynn
July 2-August 10	August 6-10	Ives
Tulane	June 18-22	Gwynn
June 4-July 13	June 25-29	Jordan
UCLA	June 18-22	Slaughter
June 15-July 28	July 16-20	Scheerer

Institute	Dates of Visits	Evaluators
University of Michigan June 25-August 3 (plus optional 2-week workshop)	June 25-29	Gerber
University of Nevada June 25-August 3	July 9-13 July 23-27	McGalliard Scheerer
University of Pittsburgh June 25-August 5	July 2-6 July 16-20 August 7	Albrecht Burton Gerber
University of Texas June 12-July 23	June 18-22 July 2-6	Albrecht Slaughter
University of Washington June 18-July 27	June 25-29 July 9-13	McGalliard Scheerer
University of Wisconsin June 25-August 3	July 2-6 July 23-27	Tuttle Dickinson

APPENDIX E

Checklist for Discussions with Participants

1. General Aims

Does participant know what the aims of the Institute were?
Does he approve of these aims?
How effectively were the aims presented to him?
Has he changed his opinion regarding the aims?

2. Administration

Did he like the arrangement of classes and workshop?
Does he feel the Institute was well directed?
Was the work load too heavy?

3. Participants

Does he feel the process of selecting participants was a successful one?
Does he feel the group was too heterogeneous?
Did he get to know the other participants well?
Does he feel he learned much of value from contact with other participants?

4. The Literature Course

4.1 To what extent has he changed his approach in the teaching of literature as a result of the Institute (e.g., more close analysis)?
4.2 Has he made any basic organizational changes in his courses as a result of attending the Institute classes in Literature? Are changes planned for the future?
4.3 What materials has he used this year that he probably would not have used had he not attended the classes in Literature? Are there new materials he will recommend when the time comes?
4.4 What classroom procedures has he used this year that he probably would not have used had he not attended the classes in Literature?
4.5 Have his assignments in literature changed as a result of the Institute?
4.6 In retrospect, what were the Literature course's most valuable aspects for him personally? its chief disappointments?

5. The Language Course

5.1 Which approach to language was stressed in his Institute? To what extent has he changed his attitude toward the criterion of usage as a result of the Institute? toward parts of speech and syntax?

5.2 Has he changed the organization of his courses as a result of attending the Institute classes in Language? Is any change anticipated?

5.3 What materials has he used this year that he probably would not have used had he not attended the classes in Language? Are there materials that he will recommend when the time comes?

5.4 What classroom procedures has he used this year that he probably would not have used had he not attended the classes in Language?

5.5 Have his assignments in Language changed as a result of the Institute?

5.6 How, in general, does he describe and evaluate the effects of the Language course on his thinking and teaching? What were the course's most valuable aspects for him personally? its greatest disappointments? Does he plan further study in language?

6. The Composition Course

6.1 Which Composition course was taught in his Institute--#1 (Phaedrus) or #2 ? Has his approach to the teaching of composition changed as a result of taking this Composition course?

6.2 Has he changed the organization of his courses as a result of the Institute classes in Composition?

6.3 What materials has he used this year that he probably would not have used had he not attended the Institute classes in Composition? Are there new materials that he will recommend when the time comes?

6.4 What classroom procedures has he used this year that he probably would not have used had he not attended the Institute classes in Composition?

6.5 Has the nature of his assignments in composition changed as a result of the Institute (e.g., in subject, length, type of writing, etc.)? Has he changed his method of grading? of commenting on papers?

6.6 How, in general, does he describe and evaluate the effects of the Composition course on his thinking and teaching (e.g., has it changed his notion of what constitutes good writing)? What were the course's most valuable aspects for him personally? its greatest disappointments?

7. Workshop

7.1 What specifically has he used this year that he or others produced in the workshop?

7.2 What suggestions does he have for the workshop (e.g., scheduling, length of time, class hours, etc.)?

7.3 What does he now think of the workshop? What were its most useful aspects for him personally? its greatest disappointments?

8. Integration

What has he done as a result of the Institute (or what does he anticipate doing) to integrate the work in the three disciplines?
Does he think integration desirable or feasible? If so, what, how, and how much?

9. Tests

What effect has the Institute had upon his testing of students?

10. The Participant and His School

10.1 To what extent has he been free to change his curriculum, materials, approach? In what particular respects has he been unable to do what he would like to do?
10.2 Has he found the Institute work helpful in his teaching of students who do not intend to go to college?
10.3 In what specific ways has his Institute experience been utilized in his school? community? Is further utilization likely?
10.4 What effect has his Institute experience had on his work? What effect on the work and thinking of other teachers in his school or school system?
10.5 What is the attitude of his colleagues toward his having gone to an Institute? Would any of them like to go to one as a result of his having gone? If so, on what subjects would they especially like help?

11. Participant and Personal Development

What specific changes in his personal life have taken place as a result of the Institute (e.g., reading, promotion, plans for graduate work)?

12. CEEB Follow-ups

What form did the CEEB follow-up take?
What further help from the CEEB would be profitable?
What does participant feel he gained from CEEB follow-up visit?

13. General Evaluation

13.1 What does the participant now think about the value of the Institute? Has his thinking changed from that previously reported on our questionnaire? If he had it to do over, would he go? Would he go if there were no subsidy?

13.2 What recommendations would he make for the benefit of directors of subsequent Institutes? Especially what recommendations would he make about the selection of staff and participants?

APPENDIX F

Name of administrator______________
High school______________________
Address_________________________
____
Institute participant attended

Checklist for Discussions

With Principals, Department Heads, etc.

1. The administrator's attitude toward the Institute, his enthusiasm for future institutes.

2. The administrator's impression of the participant's attitude toward the Institute.

3. Any changes already evident in the participant's teaching as a result of the Institute.

4. Ways in which the participant's Institute experience has been utilized (or will be utilized) in the school, the school system, the community.

5. The attitude, if known, of the other teachers toward the participant because of his attendance at the Institute (e.g., respect, envy, annoyance).

6. The attitude, if known, of students toward the participant because of his attendance at the Institute.

7. The attitude, if known, of parents toward the participant because of his attendance at the Institute.

8. The opinion of the administrator on the most effective ways of recruiting for future institutes.

9. Other comments (Continue to the back side of the page if necessary.)

APPENDIX G

Name________________________
Address_______________________
____
Institute______________________

Questionnaire on the CEEB Institutes

(All information will remain anonymous.)

1. As you look back on the Institute now, how much do you feel it contributed to your intellectual growth?
   VERY GREATLY   GREATLY   MODERATELY   LITTLE   VERY LITTLE

2. How much do you feel that the Institute contributed to your skill as a teacher?
   VERY GREATLY   GREATLY   MODERATELY   LITTLE   VERY LITTLE

3. What do you now think about the size of the Institute?
   MUCH TOO LARGE   TOO LARGE   ABOUT RIGHT   TOO SMALL   MUCH TOO SMALL

4. How long was your Institute? Encircle: 5 weeks 6 weeks 8 weeks

   In view of what the Institute tried to accomplish, what do you think about the length of the term?
   MUCH TOO LONG   TOO LONG   ABOUT RIGHT   TOO SHORT   MUCH TOO SHORT

   What length of Institute would normally be best for you, keeping in mind both your desire to learn and your desire to have some summer relaxation? Encircle:
   2 weeks   4 weeks   6 weeks   8 weeks   10 weeks

5. What do you now think about the work load?
   MUCH TOO HEAVY   TOO HEAVY   ABOUT RIGHT   TOO LIGHT
   MUCH TOO LIGHT

6. Taking them as a group, how would you rate the 40 or so participants who attended your Institute?
   EXCELLENT   GOOD   AVERAGE   FAIR   POOR

7. What are your reactions now to the Literature course?

   a. Its Instructor:
      BRILLIANT   EXCELLENT   GOOD   FAIR   POOR   VERY POOR
   b. Its value for your own education:
      EXTREMELY VALUABLE   VALUABLE   SOME VALUE   LITTLE VALUE
      NO VALUE

c. Its practical value for your teaching so far this year:
EXTREMELY VALUABLE VALUABLE SOME VALUE LITTLE VALUE
NO VALUE

8. What are your reactions now to the Language course?

a. Its Instructor:
BRILLIANT EXCELLENT GOOD FAIR POOR VERY POOR
b. Its value for your own education:
EXTREMELY VALUABLE VALUABLE SOME VALUE LITTLE VALUE
NO VALUE
c. Its practical value for your teaching so far this year:
EXTREMELY VALUABLE VALUABLE SOME VALUE LITTLE VALUE
NO VALUE

9. What are your reactions now to the Composition course?

a. Its Instructor:
BRILLIANT EXCELLENT GOOD FAIR POOR VERY POOR
b. Its value for your own education:
EXTREMELY VALUABLE VALUABLE SOME VALUE LITTLE VALUE
NO VALUE
c. Its practical value for your teaching so far this year:
EXTREMELY VALUABLE VALUABLE SOME VALUE LITTLE VALUE
NO VALUE

10. Rank the following (1, 2, 3, 4) from the most exciting intellectually to the least exciting:

Literature Course ____
Language Course ____
Composition Course ____
Workshop ____

11. Rank the following (1, 2, 3, 4) from the one that is proving to be of most practical help to the one that is proving to be of least practical help:

Literature Course ____
Language Course ____
Composition Course ____
Workshop ____

12. Rank the following (1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6) from the one that in retrospect seems to have contributed most to your effectiveness as a teacher to the one that seems to have contributed least:

The required reading ____
The required writing ____
The classroom discussions ____
Conferences with instructors ____
Informal discussions with other participants ____
Other (specify) ____

13. What is your overall appraisal of the Institute?
EXTREMELY VALUABLE VALUABLE SOME VALUE LITTLE VALUE
NO VALUE

14. If you had it to do over and know what you now know, would you attend the Institute? Encircle: YES NO

Would you attend even if there were no subsidy? Encircle: YES NO

15. Is there any one feature above all others that you think should be changed?____

____

____

____

16. Other comments that would help in evaluating the Institute program.__

____

____

____

____

____

____

____

____

____

____

APPENDIX H

Schedule of Follow-up Visits

(Participant's Institute) Name of High School	City and State	Date Visited	Evaluator
(Cornell)			
Central Technological	Syracuse, N.Y.	Feb. 21, 1963	Ives
Marcellus	Marcellus, N.Y.	Feb. 15, 1963	Ives
Sacred Heart Academy	Syracuse, N.Y.	Feb. 5, 1963	Ives
Vernon-Verona-Sherrill	Vernon, N.Y.	Jan. 31, 1963	Ives
(Duke)			
Central	Sanford, N.C.	Feb. 11, 1963	Burton
Chapel Hill	Chapel Hill, N.C.	Feb. 13, 1963	Burton
Fuquay Springs	Fuquay Springs, N.C.	Feb. 12, 1963	Burton
Hillside	Durham, N.C.	Feb. 15, 1963	Burton
Southern	Durham, N.C.	Feb. 14, 1963	Burton
(Harvard)			
Dighton-Rehoboth Regional	Rehoboth, Mass.	Jan. 22, 1963	Gwynn
Melrose	Melrose, Mass.	Jan. 24, 1963	Gwynn
Nashoba Regional	Bolton, Mass.	Jan. 25, 1963	Gwynn
(Indiana)			
Bloomington	Bloomington, Ind.	Feb. 12, 1963	Albrecht
Crispus Attucks	Indianapolis, Ind.	Feb. 14, 1963	Albrecht
North Central	Indianapolis, Ind.	Feb. 15, 1963	Albrecht
Paoli	Paoli, Ind.	Feb. 13, 1963	Albrecht
University High School	Bloomington, Ind.	Feb. 11, 1963	Albrecht
(New York University)			
Academy of Mt. St. Ursula	New York, N.Y.	Feb. 8, 1963	Wilson
Riverdale Country	New York, N.Y.	Jan. 15, 1963	Gwynn
Scarsdale	Scarsdale, N.Y.	Jan. 16, 1963	Gwynn
(Ohio State)			
Columbus Academy	Columbus, Ohio	Feb. 13, 1963	Tuttle
Hayes	Delaware, Ohio	Feb. 14, 1963	Tuttle
Upper Arlington	Upper Arlington, Ohio	Feb. 12, 1963	Tuttle
(Penn State)			
Camp Hill	Harrisburg, Pa.	Feb. 26, 1963	Wilson
Williamson's Trade School	Media, Pa.	March 5, 1963	Wilson

(Participant's Institute) Name of High School	City and State	Date Visited	Evaluator
(Rutgers)			
South Side	Newark, N.J.	Jan. 18, 1963	Wilson
(St. Louis)			
Clayton	Clayton, Mo.	Jan. 11, 1963	Dickinson
St. Louis Country Day	St. Louis, Mo.	Feb. 14, 1963	Dickinson
St. Vincent	Perryville, Mo.	Feb. 8, 1963	Dickinson
(Southern Illinois)			
Cahokia	Cahokia, Ill.	Feb. 15, 1963	Dickinson
Jackson	Jackson, Mo.	Feb. 7, 1963	Dickinson
(Stanford)			
Albany	Albany, Calif.	Jan. 9, 1963	Jordan
Technical	Oakland, Calif.	Jan. 15, 1963	Jordan
Watsonville	Watsonville, Calif.	Jan. 23, 1963	Jordan
(State University of New York at Albany)			
West Canada Valley	Middleville, N.Y.	Jan. 25, 1963	Ives
(Tulane)			
McDonogh	New Orleans, La.	Feb. 5, 1963	Slaughter
St. Martin's Protestant Episcopal	Metairie, La.	Feb. 6, 1963	Slaughter
(UCLA)			
Anaheim	Anaheim, Calif.	Feb. 26, 1963	Scheerer
Beverly Hills	Beverly Hills, Calif.	Feb. 19, 1963	Scheerer
Mira Costa	Manhattan Beach, Calif.	Feb. 13, 1963	Scheerer
Redondo Union	Redondo Beach, Calif.	Feb. 20, 1963	Scheerer
San Marino	San Marino, Calif.	Feb. 19, 1963	Scheerer
(U. of Michigan)			
Denby	Detroit, Mich.	Feb. 18, 1963	McLaughlin
Immaculata	Detroit, Mich.	Feb. 20, 1963	McLaughlin
New Boston	Huron, Mich.	Feb. 21, 1963	McLaughlin
Northeastern and Spain Junior High	Detroit, Mich.	Feb. 19, 1963	McLaughlin
(U. of Nevada)			
Belle Vista	Fair Oaks, Calif.	Feb. 15, 1963	Scheerer
James Marshall	West Sacramento, Calif.	Jan. 17, 1963	Jordan
Nevada Union Junior High	Grass Valley, Calif.	Jan. 18, 1963	Jordan

(Participant's Institute) Name of High School	City and State	Date Visited	Evaluator
(U. of Pittsburgh)			
James A. Garfield	Garrettsville, Ohio	Feb. 15, 1963	Tuttle
Westinghouse	Pittsburgh, Pa.	Feb. 11 and 18, 1963	Tuttle
(U. of Texas)			
Carthage	Carthage, Texas	Feb. 4, 1963	Slaughter
Hillcrest	Dallas, Texas	Feb. 8, 1963	Slaughter
St. Thomas (R.C.)	Houston, Texas	Feb. 7, 1963	Slaughter
(U. of Wisconsin)			
Bradford	Kenosha, Wis.	Dec. 21, 1962	McGalliard
John Marshall	Milwaukee, Wis.	Dec. 20, 1962	McGalliard
Riverside	Milwaukee, Wis.	Dec. 19, 1962	McGalliard
West Senior	Madison, Wis.	Dec. 17, 1962	McGalliard
Whitewater	Whitewater, Wis.	Dec. 18, 1962	McGalliard

APPENDIX I

Literature Course

Participant results are based on replies to 809 questionnaires filled out during the Institutes unless it is indicated that percentages were computed from the follow-up interviews with 64 participants.

Objectives

Participants (by percent)	
Fully Acceptable	45
Acceptable	33
Acceptable in Part	18
Unacceptable	1
Don't Know Them	3

Evaluators (by Institute)	
Excellent	4
Good	7
Average	8
Fair	1
Poor	0

Organization and scope

Participants (by percent)	
Excellent	43
Good	39
Average	11
Fair	4
Poor	3

Evaluators (by Institute)	
Excellent	2
Good	8
Average	7
Fair	2
Poor	1

Level of difficulty

Participants (by percent)	
Much Too Hard	0.5
Too Hard	9
About Right	81
Too Easy	8
Much Too Easy	1.5

Evaluators (by Institute)

Courses with appropriate level of both reading and lectures: 17
Courses worth graduate credit: 15
Courses probably not worth graduate credit: 2
Courses definitely not worth graduate credit: 3

Participant ratings (by percent) of value for their own education

	During Institute	During Follow-up
Extremely Valuable	34	16
Valuable	42	45
Some Value	18	25
Little Value	5	9
No Value	1	5

Participant ratings (by percent) of value for their high-school teaching

	During Institute	During Follow-up
Extremely valuable	18	8
Valuable	41	37
Some Value	31	34
Little Value	9	16
No Value	1	5

Evaluators' general rating (by Institute) of Literature courses

Excellent	3
Good	8
Average	7
Fair	2
Poor	0

APPENDIX J

Language Course

Participant results are based on replies to 809 questionnaires filled out during the Institutes unless it is indicated that percentages were computed from the follow-up interviews with 64 participants.

Objectives

Participants (by percent)	
Fully Acceptable	30
Acceptable	35
Acceptable in Part	27
Unacceptable	3
Don't Know Them	5

Evaluators (by Institute)	
Excellent	2
Good	5
Average	10
Fair	2
Poor	1

Organization and scope

Participants (by percent)	
Excellent	31
Good	35
Average	19
Fair	7
Poor	8

Evaluators (by Institute)	
Excellent	2
Good	8
Average	4
Fair	3
Poor	1

Level of difficulty

Participants (by percent)	
Much Too Hard	4
Too Hard	21
About Right	71
Too Easy	3
Much Too Easy	1

Evaluators (by Institute)

Courses with appropriate level of both reading and lectures: 18
Courses worth graduate credit: 13
Courses not worth graduate credit: 1

Participant ratings (by percent) of value for their own education

	During Institute	During Follow-up
Extremely Valuable	23	23.5
Valuable	39	41
Some Value	27	23.5
Little Value	9	9
No Value	2	3

Participant ratings (by percent) of value for their high-school teaching

	During Institute	During Follow-up
Extremely Valuable	10	13
Valuable	28	26
Some Value	45	37
Little Value	14	16
No Value	3	8

Evaluators' general rating (by Institute) of Language courses

Excellent	4
Good	9
Average	2
Fair	3
Poor	2

APPENDIX K

Composition Course

Participant results are based on replies to 809 questionnaired filled out during the Institutes unless it is indicated that percentages were computed from the follow-up interviews with 64 participants.

Objectives

Participants (by percent)		Evaluators (by Institute)	
Fully Acceptable	40	Excellent	4
Acceptable	33	Good	6
Acceptable in Part	19	Average	9
Unacceptable	1	Fair	1
Don't Know Them	7	Poor	0

Organization and scope

Participants (by percent)		Evaluators (by Institute)	
Excellent	35	Excellent	3
Good	34	Good	2
Average	19	Average	12
Fair	6	Fair	2
Poor	6	Poor	1

Level of difficulty

Participants (by percent)	
Much Too Hard	1.5
Too Hard	11
About Right	79
Too Easy	7
Much Too Easy	1.5

Evaluators (by Institute)

Courses worth graduate credit: 8
Courses probably not worth graduate credit: 9
Courses definitely not worth graduate credit: 3

Participant ratings (by percent) of value for their own education

	During Institute	During Follow-up
Extremely Valuable	33	30
Valuable	38	36
Some Value	18	25
Little Value	9	6
No Value	2	3

Participant ratings (by percent) of value for their high-school teaching

	During Institute	During Follow-up
Extremely Valuable	28	21
Valuable	35	40
Some Value	26	25
Little Value	9	9
No Value	2	5

Evaluators' general rating (by Institute) of Composition courses

Excellent	5
Good	6
Average	7
Fair	2
Poor	0

APPENDIX L

Length of Institutes and Credit Granted

Host University	Number of Weeks in Session	Number and Type of Credit Hours
Cornell University	6	9 semester
Duke University	5	6 semester
Harvard University	8	12 semester
Indiana University	8	9 semester
New York University	6	9 semester
Ohio State University	6	9 quarter
Pennsylvania State University	6	6 semester
Rutgers--The State University	6	6 semester
St. Louis University	6	6 semester
Southern Illinois University	8	12 quarter
Stanford University	8	12 quarter
State University of New York State College, Albany	6	6 semester
Tulane University	6	6 semester
University of California at Los Angeles	6	6 semester
University of Michigan	6*	6 semester
University of Nevada	6	6 semester
University of Pittsburgh	6	6 semester

---

*optional 2-week workshop also, with 2 semester hours of credit

University of Texas	6	6 semester
University of Washington	6	10 quarter
University of Wisconsin	6	5 semester